

PAPERS AND

ADDRESSES

MOST REV. JOHN HEALY, D.D.,
Archbishop of Tuam.

PAPERS AND ADDRESSES.



+ John Kealy DD

Bishop of Toronto

PAPERS AND ADDRESSES:

THEOLOGICAL, PHILOSOPHICAL;
BIOGRAPHICAL, ARCHÆOLOGICAL.

BY THE

MOST REV. JOHN HEALY, D.D., LL.D., M.R.I.A.

Archbishop of Tuam.



baile átha cliath:

Dublin:

Comluét na pípinne Catoilice i nÉirinn,
CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY OF IRELAND,

24 Spáird naé. uí Éonail,

24 UPPER O'CONNELL STREET.

1909.

[All Rights Reserved.]



PRINTED ON
SPECIALLY MADE
IRISH PAPER
BY
DOLLARD,
PRINTINGHOUSE,
DUBLIN, LIMITED.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

WHEN it became known that in August of this year would be celebrated the Episcopal Silver Jubilee of the Archbishop of Tuam, it was felt by the Committee of the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland that they could not allow to pass, without on their part marking it in some appropriate manner, so great an occasion in the life of their first President. Accordingly, on the suggestion of some friends, they decided to do for Archbishop Healy's Jubilee what their flourishing sister Society in Australia had done a year or two ago for Archbishop Carr's, that is, gather together and publish in permanent and attractive form the most interesting of his hitherto uncollected Papers and Addresses. And so this volume has come to light, and is now offered with cordial and respectful greetings as the Society's Jubilee Gift to their Most Reverend President.

It will be noted with satisfaction that while a large variety of subjects is touched on in these Papers and Addresses, they are chiefly concerned with the discussion and elucidation of important questions in the civil and ecclesiastical history of Ireland. And they belong to every period of his Grace's well-filled literary career—as for example, the historical sketch of Gerald Barry, and the rousing metrical version of Hugh Roe O'Donnell's Address, to the far-off days when he was a simple curate in County Sligo ; or the beautiful appreciation of John Duns Scotus and the masterly exposition of the Catholic teaching on Inspiration, to his maturer years as

a Professor in Maynooth ; or, yet again, 'his famous pulpit efforts and archæological lectures, to the quarter of a century, just completed, of his episcopate—thus on from an article written the year of his ordination down to one written only a few weeks ago at the request of Cardinal Moran for the notable Catholic Congress being just now held under his Eminence's presidency in Australia.

The best thanks of the Publishers are due to the Editors respectively of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, the *Irish Monthly*, the *Dublin Review*, the *Record of the Maynooth Union*, and the *Journal of the Galway Archæological and Historical Society* for their kind permission to republish articles which originally appeared in the columns of these journals and reviews.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
THE CISTERCIANS IN IRELAND	I
THE ANNALS OF LOCH CÉ	18
THE PRIEST IN POLITICS	32
GERALD BARRY	45
DEDICATION SERMON (MAYNOOTH)	58
WAS ST. CUTHBERT AN IRISHMAN ?	78
COUNTY GALWAY ARCHEOLOGY	101
CATHOLIC ASPECTS OF TENNYSON'S POETRY	111
THE WRITINGS OF CARDINAL CULLEN	123
CONSECRATION SERMON (ARMAGH)	137
JOHN DUNS SCOTUS	154
THE BOOK OF DEER	194
THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND THE EARLY IRISH CHURCH	203
PELAGIANISM IN THE EARLY BRITISH AND IRISH CHURCHES	217
AN ISLAND SHRINE IN THE WEST	231
HUGH ROE O'DONNELL'S ADDRESS TO HIS SOLDIERS BEFORE THE BATTLE OF THE CURLEW MOUNTAINS	244
THE "STOWE MISSAL"	247
UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN IRELAND	258
ST. LIVINUS, BISHOP AND MARTYR	296
EARLY NATIONAL SYNODS IN IRELAND	308
IRELAND AND ROME	322
THE HOLY HOUSE OF LORETO	332
THE HISTORY OF SLIGO, TOWN AND COUNTY	345

	PAGE
ORIGIN, NATURE AND USE OF THE PALLIUM —	359
THE CONCURSUS FOR VACANT PARISHES —	367
SPEECH ON EDMUND BURKE — — —	377
WHAT FORCE HAVE INFORMAL WILLS IN CONSCIENCE —	383
A FAMILY OF FAMOUS CELTIC SCHOLARS —	392
CARDINAL NEWMAN ON THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE.	
No. I. — — — — —	404
CARDINAL NEWMAN ON THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE.	
No. II. — — — — —	418
BROWNSON'S WORKS — — — — —	446
THE NATIONALITY OF ST. BONIFACE — — —	456
THE HISTORIANS OF OSSORY — — — — —	463
POPE LEO XIII. ON THE ORIGIN OF THE CIVIL POWER	473
A PILGRIMAGE TO INNISMURRY — — —	487
PATRICIAN PILGRIMAGES IN IRELAND — — —	497
THE METAPHYSICS OF THE SCHOOL — — —	510
OUR IRISH ROMANESQUE ARCHITECTURE — — —	522
WESTERN ARCHÆOLOGY — — — — —	532

PAPERS AND ADDRESSES.

THE CISTERCIANS IN IRELAND.¹

THE remains of the Cistercian monasteries and monastic churches are the noblest ruins in Ireland, and must attract the attention of every cultivated mind. We find even still more imposing specimens of the architectural taste and skill of the Cistercians in various parts of England; but for the present we must confine ourselves to the history of the noble monuments which they have left us in our own country. Who were the builders of those beautiful structures? whence did they come? what work did they do for Ireland? what influence did they exert? how long did they flourish? when did they disappear? These are questions that are surely worthy of an answer; and about which educated Irishmen, and above all Irish priests, should know something definite.

There are many persons who have no sympathy with monks or monasteries now, but take the greatest interest in the examination and preservation of those grand monuments of the past from the historical and artistic point of view, and know far more about the buildings and their founders than we who inherit the ancient faith and ritual of which those monuments are the most eloquent and striking expression.

Now, if you keep your eyes open during your summer holidays you cannot fail to notice, no doubt at different times, three classes of ecclesiastical ruins characterised by striking differences. You will see on the remote shores and islands of the West, churches of the primitive type which belong to the first three centuries of our Christian history—small, oblong edifices, built of massive blocks of stone,

¹ Lecture delivered to the Students in the Aula Maxima of Maynooth College, May, 1901.

mostly without lime or other cement, having a narrow doorway with inclining jambs and massive horizontal lintel, through which you will observe a very small east window perfectly plain, also with a flat head, or if it is rounded the arch is scooped out of one or two stones. In fact, in the earliest type of church we find no traces of an arch; and if such a little church have a chancel and chancel arch we may be pretty sure that they were a later addition.

The second type of church is what is called the Irish Romanesque. The building is larger—from fifty to sixty feet long, and from twenty to thirty feet wide; it has nearly always a chancel and chancel arch, with a western or southern doorway elaborately constructed in several orders, as they are called, surmounted by a semi-circular arch richly ornamented, which is the most characteristic feature of our Irish Romanesque. The ornamentation is peculiarly Irish, consisting of pellets, zig-zags, chevrons, which can never be mistaken by those familiar with our ancient church ruins. This style of architecture was contemporaneous with our round towers, and flourished, we may say, for three centuries more—that is, from the middle of the ninth to the middle of the twelfth century. Many specimens of this style may be seen at Clonmacnoise, at Glendalough, and elsewhere. It reached its perfection in the peerless building known as Cormac's Chapel on the Rock of Cashel, which was consecrated in the year A.D. 1134. Noteworthy types of the same period, or rather remnants of them, may be seen at Tuam, Cong, Clonfert, Killeslin, Aghadoe, and other places.

A little later the Cistercians came and introduced a transition style, for they worked during the transition period, from the middle of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth century; and hence we find in their churches both the round arch and pointed arch, as in Boyle; but the elaborate Celtic ornamentation of doors and arches disappears to a great extent, whilst the edifice becomes larger, grander, and much more imposing in its majestic simplicity. But from this period onward—that is, from the middle of the thirteenth century, when the Dominicans and Franciscans began to build—we find that the round arch and Celtic ornamentation

completely disappear. You have beautiful buildings, it is true, but the arches are all more or less pointed, and the ornamentation is of the Gothic character. Hence a single glance at the principal doorway of the ruined church will nearly always show whether it is primitive, or Romanesque, or Gothic, and will also approximately fix its age, which of itself is a most important point.

Now, the appearance of the Cistercians in Ireland marks perhaps the most important epoch in the history of our national Church since the time of St. Patrick. It was the time of a reformation—a true reformation—that was greatly needed, and one in which the Cistercians took a very conspicuous part, to the lasting benefit of the Irish Church. Let me call your special attention to this aspect of the question.

The state of the Irish Church at the end of the eleventh century was very deplorable. This arose, first of all, from the grave abuses that had grown up during the Danish wars in Ireland, when all was bloodshed and confusion. Monasteries were destroyed; churches were burned; clergy and monks were slain; the schools were closed; the books themselves were burned or “drowned;” and a systematic attempt was made to destroy Christianity throughout the island. The Danes became Christians towards the end of the tenth century; but their ravages did not on that account cease, and it was not until the strong hand of Brian the Great overthrew them that the land began to breathe again.

But after the death of the hero of Clontarf there was no really supreme king in Ireland, and hence the greatest disorders still continued during the eleventh century. It was South against North, and East against West; and each province, too, was subdivided against itself, so that it was a period of great anarchy and bloodshed, because there was no central and supreme authority in the land.

Not only was there no civil authority supreme; there was no ecclesiastical authority either. For two hundred years the Chair of St. Patrick, the natural centre of authority, was held in a kind of hereditary succession by eight *comarbs*, or Heirs of Patrick, who were called High Bishops of Armagh, but were really laymen, in the sense that they were without

holy orders. On this point we have the unexceptionable testimony of St. Bernard, who describes them fully in three words : *Uxorati, literati tamen, sed sine ordinibus*. Yet they were clerics ; they had tonsure or perhaps, minor orders ; they had studied for the Church, were qualified to hold benefices, or at least to acquire them, but instead of taking holy orders they took wives, thus exercising the episcopal jurisdiction—I am not prepared to say invalidly—*per se*, and exercising the power of orders *per alios*, that is, by regularly-ordained bishops, one of whom always dwelt at Armagh.

It is easy to see that this system was fatal to the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline, and was another great cause of the deplorable state to which the Irish Church had fallen. The Pope was far away and the lay-primates had no desire to communicate with him. Besides the state of things on the continent itself up to the time of Gregory VII. was almost as bad as it was in Ireland. Simony and concubinage prevailed very widely even in Italy, in Milan for instance, and at times in Rome itself. It seemed, as Baronius has said and Bede predicted, as if the divine Pilot of Peter's Barque was asleep during the tenth century, and there was none to awake him. He did awake later on—or rather He never slept—and He calmed the raging storm but not without the visible exercise of power divine.

There are traces of simony and concubinage in the Irish Church, too, at this time ; there were incestuous marriages within the forbidden degrees ; there were irregular ordinations ; there were bishops living in monasteries without sees, who often did more harm than good ; there were vagabond monks without discipline and fond of fighting ; there were many different *ordos* and liturgies in existence ; St. Bernard says that the sacraments of baptism, confirmation, and penance were greatly neglected ; there were no metropolitans, and hence every one of the one hundred or more bishops who lived in the country was pretty free to do exactly as he pleased. This is not an overdrawn picture of the state of affairs in Ireland at the end of the eleventh century ; and a terrible pestilence which desolated the whole country in the

year 1095 was justly regarded as the chastisement of the crimes of the whole nation. Many penitential works were at the same time prescribed and performed to save the nation from the "fire of vengeance," to use the expression of the Four Masters.

But these evil days were even then closing, and better days were near the dawning, which began about this very time. No doubt there was a kind of reformation taking place all over Europe at the same period, mainly owing to two causes—the action of the popes and the agency of the religious orders, that is the new reforms of the ancient orders ; and of these the Cistercian reform at this time was just beginning in France.

It is singular that the Irish reform began almost simultaneously both in the North and in the South at the very beginning of the twelfth century, and in quarters whence we should least expect it. Imar O'Hagan, of Armagh, and his pupil, Cellach or Celsus, were the first to begin the work of God in Armagh ; and the bishops of two Danish towns, Malchus of Waterford, and Gillebert of Limerick, both inspired by St. Anselm and supported by the Pope, were the chief agents in the South of Ireland. It is curious too that in this matter the North most cordially joined the South, and it was by their joint action that the first and perhaps the most important steps were taken in the new reformation.

Celsus, himself a member of the usurping family in Armagh, was irregularly consecrated at the early age of twenty-six ; but he was a man of God and one of the great reformers of the Church in his time. He visited Munster officially and was well received there the year after his consecration, that is 1107, and ever afterwards he was as much at home in Munster as in the North. He died at Ardpatrik, near Charleville,¹ when he went to Munster trying, it seems, to make peace amongst the turbulent Irish princes. He was entirely opposed to the hereditary succession in Armagh ; and the greatest service he rendered to the Irish Church was to send his crozier, doubtless the famous staff of Jesus, by the hand of its hereditary custodian to St. Malachy, Bishop of

¹ There was a royal residence not far off—the Moat of Killinane.

Connor, intimating that he willed his succession to Armagh, which took place five years later, after much confusion and bloodshed, in A.D. 1134. Celsus is justly described by the Four Masters as a "Son of purity"—not like his predecessors—"the only head whom the foreigners and Irish of Ireland both clergy and laity obeyed." He willed to be buried in Lismore, which is not far from Ardpatrick.

Imar O'Hagan was a professor of Armagh, and afterwards became a recluse there. He was the chief teacher of St. Celsus; but his greatest service to the Irish Church was his building or restoration of the church called the Regles or Abbey church of St. Peter and St. Paul at Armagh, and his introduction there of the reform of the Canons Regular, which was afterwards adopted in several of the cathedral churches of Ireland, notably in Dublin, Tuam, and Cong, with the greatest advantage to the regular service of those churches. He afterwards went to Rome and died there on his pilgrimage in the year 1134—the very year in which Cormac's Chapel was consecrated at Cashel, and Malachy got possession of Armagh.

Of the bishops of the two Danish towns of Waterford and Limerick we know little. Both certainly had the advantage of being trained abroad; both were Irish; and the education of both was probably of a higher kind than any of their contemporaries received at home. Malchus of Waterford had been in his youth a monk of Winchester, but was by birth an Irishman,¹ hence we find King Mortogh O'Brien with several princes and prelates recommending him for episcopal consecration to Anselm, who did consecrate him in the year A.D. 1097. Anselm sent back by Malchus a letter to the king and the prelates calling their attention to certain grave abuses then existing in the Irish Church, to which Lanfranc had previously called the attention of the king and of the Irish bishops. The gravest charge is that of interchanging wives, which was also made by Lanfranc, and for which it is to be feared there must have been some foundation. These letters of Anselm stimulated the King, Mortogh O'Brien, and O'Dunan, Bishop of Cashel—

¹ So Bernard tells us, but he calls him Bishop of Lismore.

an excellent prelate, to whom the king had made over his own royal seat of Cashel to become the first see of Munster—and the other princes and prelates of the South to convene a Synod in 1111 at Fiadh Mac Aengusa in Meath for the reformation of abuses. Celsus of Armagh, who had visited Munster in 1107, cordially co-operated; and it would appear that Gillebert, Bishop of Limerick, was named, doubtless through the influence of St. Anselm, as legate of the Pope, and in that capacity presided at the Synod. The *Chronicon Scotorum* tells us there were fifty-eight bishops present at that Synod, and likely all, especially those from the North, did not attend. Later on another Synod was held at Rathbreasail for the more exact delimitation of the Irish dioceses—a reformation greatly needed. Gillebert also wrote two very useful works, one, *De Usu Ecclesiastico*, which was designed to expound the Roman liturgical usage, and try to make the Irish usage conformable to it. Another work of Gillebert's was *De Statu Ecclesiae*, a kind of short treatise on the Church with special reference to the various grades in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. We see then that King Mortogh O'Brien himself, St. Celsus, O'Duman of Cashel, and the Bishops of Waterford and Limerick, were the most influential agents in bringing about this Irish reformation, at least in the beginning.

But it is to St. Malachy the success of the reform is mainly due; and the chief instrument which St. Malachy employed was the introduction of the Cistercians into Ireland. I cannot now refer to all that St. Malachy accomplished in Down, Connor, and Armagh. His greatest work was to destroy at the peril of his life the hereditary claims of one family to be the *comarbs*, or successors, of St. Patrick in the primatial see. Of no less importance was his introduction of the Cistercians into Ireland.

In the year A.D. 1139, when journeying to Rome to procure the *pallia* for the Archbishops of Armagh and Cashel, he stayed for some days at St. Bernard's great monastery of Clairvaux. This famous house, founded a few years previously, was itself a daughter of the Abbey of Citeaux—in Latin *Cistercium*—where the new reform of the Benedictine Order

originated. The main purpose of its founders, the monks Robert and Stephen Harding—the latter an Englishman—was to bring back their subjects to the strict observance of the ancient Benedictine Rule, and in that they had a most marvellous success. St. Bernard, however, may be regarded as the real founder, for it was his fame as a preacher, a theologian, a reformer, as well as his great influence with popes and kings that caused the rapid spread of the Cistercian Order throughout all the countries of western Europe.

The chapters in the *Life of St. Malachy*, in which Bernard describes the visits of the Irish saint to Citeaux, are extremely interesting. Malachy was greatly edified by the holy community; and Bernard says they found in him a real spiritual treasure. But he stayed there only a short time, crossing the Alps by the pass which leads past Ivrea, or Iporia, as St. Bernard calls it, more anciently Eporedia, where it is said St. Patrick met the messengers announcing the death of Palladius, and where, more than three centuries after St. Bernard, the Blessed Thady M'Carthy, found the bed of a poor pilgrim and the grave of a saint.

Malachy spent a month in Rome. Pope Innocent II. received him with the greatest kindness, and asked him much about Ireland, which was then quite a *terra incognita* to the Romans. Malachy asked to be allowed to live and die at Clairvaux; the Pope would not hear of his living there; but, as Bernard observes, God gave him the favour of dying there. Malachy asked for the confirmation of the new metropolitan see of Cashel erected by Celsus; the Pope granted it. But when he asked for the *pallia* for Armagh and Cashel, "not yet," said the Pope, "you must convene a general, that is a plenary, synod of bishops, clergy, and nobles; make your request then by worthy delegates and it will be granted." At the same time taking off his own stole and mitre and maniple he clothed Malachy with them, and appointed him his legate in Ireland; all the more readily as the aged Gillebert of Limerick was no longer able, and had said so, to discharge the onerous duties of that office.

On his return Malachy left four of his companions at Clairvaux to be trained in the monastic discipline of the

place; for Malachy himself told Bernard that, although they had monks of old in Ireland, they had now only the name not the reality—a significant description of the Irish monasteries of the time. When Malachy returned home he sent others to be trained in the religious life; and, on their return to their own country, Bernard added as many as were necessary to form a complete religious community, which would be about twenty at least, and so it was that Mellifont came to be peopled with its first monks, Irish and French. St. Bernard adds that the new institution soon conceived and brought forth five daughters. He does not give the names; but we know they were Newry, Bective, Boyie, Baltinglass, and Monasternenagh, in the County Limerick—all founded during the lifetime of St. Bernard, and, therefore, several years before the Norman set his foot on Irish soil—an important point to remember, which of itself refutes a great number of ignorant calumnies about Ireland.

Mellifont, the Irish mother-house of the Cistercians, was founded most probably in the year A.D. 1142. All the Cistercian houses were built on the same plan, but not, of course, with equal magnificence. Mellifont was, indeed, a typical Cistercian house, not only in its buildings, but also in its well-chosen site and surroundings. “Benedict loved the hills, but Bernard preferred the valleys”—quiet woodland valleys watered by pleasant streams—in this as in many other things exhibiting the poetry of the monastic life. Wordsworth tells us somewhere that there are two voices which speak to men of liberty—the voice from the mountains and the voice from the sea. The primitive monks in Ireland long before the Cistercians loved to hear these two great voices which spoke to them of God; and, therefore, they built their little oratories and cells in the very wildest and remotest islands of the western seas like Aran, Ardilaun, and the Skelligs, or hid them far away in the hearts of the mountains as at Glendalough, or even on their lone summits as on Slieve Donard and Mount Brandon, which have taken their names from two saints, Domanard and Brendan. Not so the sons of St. Bernard; they rather loved the quiet voices of their own sweet valleys, the whispering woods and

murmuring waters, the songs of the birds, and the hum of the noontide bees, with all the other sounds and sights that lend an undying charm to the innocent and laborious life of the country. You know how divinely Virgil describes the manifold charms of a country life even in what appears to be its most ordinary aspects. Well, you will find them all, and more than all, in the life and surroundings of a Cistercian monastery, for there are elements of poetry in the religious life of the monks, especially the Benedictine monks, that the great Roman poet never dreamt of. Cardinal Newman with a master's hand has pointed out some of them in his account of the "Mission of St. Benedict" and "The Benedictine Schools." I cannot now refer to these points; but some of them, as described by Virgil, lie on the very surface of monastic life. You have "*the *secura quies et nescia jallere vita**"—the peaceable and innocent life far away from the cares and crimes of cities. The monks laboured with their own hands; but they laboured for God, and took no thought for the morrow, for the grateful soil responsive to their holy labours gave them all they needed for their simple fare—" *quibus facilem victum fundit humo justissima tellus.*" In a sense, diviner far than Virgil's, they watched the starry paths at night, and gazed with a deeper awe on the manifold wonders of heaven and earth and sea. The flowing river by which they walked reminded them of the fleeting life of man; and the restfulness of their woodland valleys was an emblem of the divine peace of soul, which God gives to all those who love Him and trust Him.

Like Virgil, St. Bernard and his monks loved the country and the valleys watered with perennial streams:—" *At rura mihi placeant et rigui in vallibus amnes,*" but they had higher motives in flying from the world and especially from its cities and towns. Their main purpose in seeking solitude was to be alone with God, and to maintain that union by unceasing prayer and meditation. Their purpose was to save their own souls, but not in idleness. They accepted the maxim of St. Paul, that every man was to eat his own bread, and therefore labour for it that he might have wherewith to eat, and something also to give to those

who were in need. The Cistercians in this differed essentially from the mendicant orders who came after them. These preached the Gospel and lived by the Gospel—they were missionaries ; but the Cistercians lived by the labour of their hands. They undertook no missionary work, and shunned the world as much as possible, except when popes or prelates called them as they called St. Bernard to leave the retirement of his beloved cloister, and once more, for the good of the Church, mix himself with men. But this was not their purpose ; it was rather quite foreign to the object of their institute.

I said the Cistercian monasteries were all built after a common plan. I can only point to its leading features. Their buildings were not more elegant or ornate, but they were larger and more imposing than anything seen before in Ireland, and are still the most striking of the many ruined edifices throughout the country ; yet they were not at all equal in magnitude to the great abbeys of their own order at Fountains, Bolton, Melrose, and elsewhere. Mellifont has almost disappeared, the foundations of the church can barely be traced ; but several of the Cistercian churches still remain, eloquent witnesses to their founders' zeal for the grandeur and beauty of God's house. A fine specimen is still to be seen at Boyle and another at Holy Cross, and also I believe at Tintern and Dunbrody. The most characteristic feature of these churches is the great central tower at the junction of the nave, choir and transepts. It was supported on four arches opening on each of these parts of the church respectively ; the arches are generally very lofty and majestic in their strength and symmetry. The tower was not very high, but it was massive, resting at once lightly and securely on the arches. The transepts had each two small chapels, generally used as mortuary chapels, on their eastern side—another characteristic feature. The nave was open to the public, the choir and chancel beyond it were reserved for the monks. The eastern window over the chancel, which was rectangular, was also very large and lofty, from forty to fifty feet high, and when filled with stained glass was a very beautiful and conspicuous object. The cloister adjoined the

church on the south, to which it gave access by two doors, one entering on the nave, the other on the southern transept. Around the cloister in the usual way were the chapter room, the refectory, with its kitchen, the community room and the store rooms. Over these buildings, looking out on the cloister, were the dormitories for the monks.

One might naturally inquire how were the poor monks able to build such edifices. Well in the first place those "were the ages of faith," when kings and nobles vied with each other in building and endowing abbeys, where holy men gave their lives to the services of God. So the Irish kings or chiefs first of all gave a beautiful site with its surrounding fields—wood, water, arable and pasture—for the benefit of the monks. Then all their wealthy neighbours gave their own gifts, and we have recorded in the *Annals of the Four Masters* the splendid gifts which the chiefs and ladies of Meath and Oriel gave at the consecration of the abbey church at Mellifont.

But more than all other things their own admirable organization enabled the monks to found new houses and erect their buildings. A great Cistercian monastery was in every respect a perfectly self-sufficing institution. First of all every large house had its own staff of tradesmen amongst the brotherhood—masons, carpenters, stonecutters, painters, and so forth; and each of the trades had its own foreman. The *Annals* for instance record the death of the foreman or master-mason of the abbey of Boyle. For these abbeys besides their own buildings, when they became wealthy, had large outlying farms called granges, where the buildings were also kept in repair. It was easy enough therefore when a new house was to be founded for the Order to send a full staff of tradesmen to do the work—it was easy to feed them, and materials were abundant, so that comparatively little money was required. Then all these men laboured for God—*laborare est orare*—it was not for money but for God they did their work; and hence they did it so thoroughly, so grandly, so beautifully, that their labour in those far off days still puts to shame even the greatest achievements of our boasted civilization.

Then, again, the community produced everything that was needed for itself. They had food—ample food—from their own fields, gardens, and orchards. They had fish from their own streams. They had wool for their own habits from their own sheep, they spun, wove, and wrought it themselves, for they were their own tailors and shoemakers. They had their own mills; they ground their own corn, and baked their own bread; they brewed their own beer, and they got their own wine, so far as they needed it, from their own houses in France; they had their own fuel, peat, and wood, and oils for their lamps.

Moreover, every abbey had its own school for the younger members of the community. It was the wish of St. Benedict to take boys when still young and innocent, and train them up from the beginning in monastic discipline. He himself took St. Maur at the age of eleven or twelve; Bede was only seven when he first went to Wear; and such was the universal custom in all the houses of the Order. The youth of the neighbourhood were also admitted to those monastic schools, and received such education as they needed. And, as we have seen, the monastery had a technical school as well as a literary school, and, above all, it was an agricultural school for all the country round. Irish agriculture, such as it is, owes much to the Cistercians. They reclaimed and manured the land; they raised abundant crops; they made their fields the greenest and most fertile in the whole country. They are still to be seen—those fertile fields—now in the hands of the stranger, oftentimes reclaimed from the brake and morass by the unceasing labour of the monks. The Celts were not great agriculturists; they were rather a pastoral people. The Cistercians were their best teachers in showing how to till the soil extensively and successfully.

But the Cistercian monastery was much more than a technical school and agricultural college. It did all the work of a poor-house, a dispensary, and a hotel for the surrounding country. The monks were not all physicians, but many of them were highly skilled in the medical science of the time, and gave the benefit of their advice not only to their own brethren, but to all the sick in the neighbourhood,

to whom both medicine and medical advice were freely and gratuitously dispensed whenever it was needed. They had not all the drugs you will find in a modern dispensary, and, perhaps, that was so much the better; but they had the simple remedies such as you sometimes need yourselves; and they were generally found to be efficacious, for many of the monks were excellent botanists, and it is said the herbs of the field have a remedy for every disease, if we could only find them out.

Then the monastic hospice was a home for every traveller, where, in fact, he might stay as long as he pleased, and where he was in no trouble about the bill. If he gave a donation to the poor, well and good; if not, he might depart as freely as he came. At the doors of the hospice the poor of the neighbourhood were always welcome. All the surplus food was distributed to them daily, according to their needs; and the monks would sooner go hungry themselves than see the poor go hungry from their doors.

It is easy to see what an enormous influence for good such institutions must have exercised throughout all Ireland. There were about forty-five of them in all, and they were all founded from the middle of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth century; and we find them in almost every county of Ireland. Before the advent of the Anglo-Normans the native princes had founded some ten or twelve; the conquerors, who won the richest lands in the country, founded many more, and peopled them with monks, mostly from the English houses. John de Courcy and his wife founded three on the shores of Strangford Lough, and Tintern, Dunbrody, and many others in the South of Ireland were founded by the Anglo-Norman chiefs. In later times many of these great abbeys, in the Pale especially, became fortresses in the English interest; and the Palesmen went so far as to pass a law that no mere Irishman should be professed in these houses. It was an odious law, hateful to all good men, and was annulled in the general chapter of the Cistercians themselves. It was however, often, but not always, enforced, to the great detriment of the religious life in those very institutions in which it was sought to enforce it.

In course of time these great abbeys grew to be very wealthy and powerful. The abbots of no less than eleven or twelve amongst them became peers of Parliament, and were summoned to the great councils of the king in Ireland, an honour which they did not always appreciate, for we find them petitioning in certain cases to be relieved of the duty. The abbots, too, became great landlords ; they held estates in many parishes ; and had a numerous and, on the whole, a very prosperous tenantry besides many villeins or serfs for working their farms and granges. Still it caused evil to the spirit of the religious life ; the monk did not find it necessary to work as of old ; other people worked for him. He became lazy, his rule was relaxed, and with laziness and non-observance of his rule in its strictness other evils grew apace.

Things were not so bad here as they were in England ; but still the monasteries in the reign of Henry VIII. were very different from what they were in the reign of Henry II. But even in the worst times they were a great blessing to the country. The worship of God was carried out with regularity and even splendour ; the sacraments were regularly administered, for all these abbeys had the care not of one, but sometimes of several parishes. Sermons were regularly preached in the abbey churches, and thus they became the great centres of religious life in the country.

Many bishops, too, were taken from the monks and abbots of those houses, religious-minded men trained in regular discipline, good scholars and sound theologians, far better than could be found at the time among the secular clergy.

But Gerald Barry tells us that although excellent monks they were not always efficient bishops, for they preferred the peace and quiet of their community to the dangers and hardships of the missionary life. Hence they failed in the regular visitation of their dioceses, and left their flocks very often without proper instruction and exhortation, a neglect which is always the fruitful source of many evils.

But, at last when the end came, and Henry VIII. first, and afterwards Elizabeth, decreed that the Cistercians should fall, they fell nobly. They were more helpless victims of

those terrible laws than the Mendicants, for they were as it were *adscripti glebae*—they were bound to the soil on which they lived, and they had no other sustenance. Then they had the richest lands in the country, the best fishings, the finest woodlands—a tempting bait for the greedy minions of the tyrants. The Mendicant could live on his wits much better than the Cistercian: he knew the country better: he had his places of refuge; he knew how to disguise himself, whereas the poor Cistercian mingling with the world was like a man travelling in a foreign country almost helpless. So they fell, and almost completely disappeared from the land; but they fell, as I have said, nobly—more nobly, I think, than they did in England. Let me cite a few instances, taken from the work of the late learned and lamented Father Murphy, whose voice some of you heard from this very platform not long ago.

I do not now refer to the many illustrious men whom the Cistercian Order produced in Ireland from St. Malachy and St. Christian and Felix O'Dulanny down to the latest saint in Ireland. I wish only to refer to a few of their martyrs, especially under Queen Elizabeth.

At Carlow Graigue, on the banks of the Barrow, twelve monks went out in their vestments and habits to meet the spoilers, and refusing to yield obedience to the Queen's commands, were slain where they stood. There was a family of seven brothers in Raphoe. The eldest, Gelasius, was Abbot of Boyle; the third, James, was Abbot of Assaroe; the youngest, John, was Bishop of Raphoe, and a confessor for the faith. But Gelasius, the eldest, was tried in Dublin, found guilty of being a monk, and hanged in his habit outside the city walls. His clothes were torn into pieces by the people to be preserved as the relics of a saint and martyr. About the same time Nicholas Fitzgerald, another Cistercian, was hanged and quartered near Dublin, in the year 1581. Patrick and Malachi, two monks of Boyle, were hanged for their faith, and quartered whilst they were yet alive, having been cut down from the gibbet. The venerable Abbot of Assaroe, Eugene O'Gallagher, and Brother O'Trevir, one of his monks, were slain near their own walls by the heretics

of Donegal after the Flight of the Earls, and so, in like manner, scores of the white-robed Cistercians, whose names and history you will find in Father Murphy's book—the *Triumphalia S. Crucis*—gave their lives for the faith mostly in the South and West, where they lingered longest, for in the Pale they had been robbed and driven out long before, during the blessed days of King Henry VIII., the Defender of the Faith! Many of those holy men, too, belonged to the noblest families in the land; and yet we are sometimes told that Elizabeth really did not persecute. She punished only political traitors! Whatever these men were they were not traitors or politicians, for all they asked was to be allowed to die in peace near their ancient homes.

And now, let me say once more what I said in the beginning, that I have spoken of these things not to give you full knowledge, but to stimulate you to study those subjects for yourselves. Believe me you will find them full of interest and full of edification. I can safely say that there is not a single fact you learn about the ecclesiastical history of Ireland, that as preachers of the Gospel you will not find useful at one time or another, and what is more you will find that your people will be as deeply interested in them as yourselves.

Then, again, I want you, the "sons of learning," as the Annalists call you, the rising hope and joy of our Irish Church, I want you to take at least as deep an interest in these subjects as the non-Catholic antiquarians, whom you will now find in every part of Ireland—gentlemen, too, and scholars, I assure you, of wide culture, for the study of those subjects appears to have a softening and sweetening influence on the asperities even of the rudest and most bigoted natures. But I want you, the children of St. Patrick, the heirs of his inheritance, to be able to hold your own against all comers in these matters, and to show that you do, in fact as well as in law, inherit the spirit and traditions of the ancient Church of Ireland.

THE ANNALS OF LOCH CÉ.¹

IRELAND is pre-eminently a land of beautiful lakes. They are the admiration of every tourist who beholds them, when young summer clothes their wooded shores in maiden splendour and every crag and islet is mirrored in their glancing waters. But for the Irishman of cultured mind and truly patriot heart they are more than beautiful; he must love them with a "love far-brought from out the storied past," for their very names are the creation of romantic legend, their shores and islands are strewn with venerable ruins suggestive of historic and literary associations, and many of them hallowed by holiest memories.

In this respect, with the exception of Lough Corrib, to which Sir W. Wilde has done full justice, there is, perhaps, no other lake in Ireland so variously interesting to the antiquarian as Lough Key, near Boyle, in the county Roscommon. On Inis Mac Nerinn are the ruins of an old Columbian monastery. Trinity Island, in the same lake, takes its name from a famous abbey of the Order of Premonstré, which produced many distinguished churchmen; another, now called Castle Island, but anciently known as Carraig Mac Diarmida, or Dermott's Rock, was for five hundred years the stronghold and residence of a powerful and far-descended race. Besides, at least three of our ancient Books of Annals were written on the islands, or in the neighbourhood of Lough Key—the *Annals of Boyle*, the so-called *Annals of Connaught*, and the *Annals* which now take their name from the lake itself. This last volume, ably edited and translated by Mr. Hennessy, and published under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, is likely to give the lake, from which it takes its name, a wider and more enduring fame.

Lough Key (or Cé) forms the northern boundary of the celebrated Plains of Boyle, "the best territory in Erin of

¹ *The Annals of Loch Cé* (A Chronicle of Irish Affairs from A.D. 1014—A.D. 1590). Edited with a Translation by William M. Hennessy, M.R.I.A. Published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, 1871.

its own size," quaintly remark the *Annals*, anno 1478. It is merely an expansion of the Boyle river which carries down the surplus waters of Lough Gara to Ireland's great central canal, the Shannon. It is about six miles in length, and three in average breadth, and contains no less than thirty-six beautifully wooded islands—

"Islets so freshly fair,
That never hath bird come nigh them,
But from his course through air,
Hath been won downward by them."

On the north-west rises the rugged range of the Curlew Mountains—anciently known as Cor Slieve-na-Seghsa—which contrast finely with the rich woodlands and swelling pastures of the southern shore. The beautiful mansion of Rockingham, approached through a noble avenue of stately beeches, stands on an elevated plateau at the water's edge, and commands a fine prospect of the lake and its numerous islands, with a striking background of heathery mountain-summits in the distance.

History, science, and romance each gives a different account of the origin of the name Lough Key, and, to say the truth, we hardly know which account to credit. Let the reader judge for himself. According to the bardic legend, the lake derived its name from a woman named Cé, who was the daughter of Manannan Mac Lir, the Irish Neptune. She belonged to the giants of Keshcarran in Sligo, but was disfigured and made insane by enchantment. She then fled towards Lough Key, to which she gave her name, and where she remained for twelve months. After that she returned to Kesh, where all refused to admit her on account of her ugliness except Oisín, who gave her an asylum. On the following day she became again a beautiful woman, and took Oisín with her to the "Land of Perpetual Youth," where they remain to this day. According to the ollaves, "when the battle of Magh-Tuiredh Cunga was fought between Eochaidh the son of Erc, and Nuada the Silver-handed King of the Tuatha de Danaan, on which occasion the Feara-Bolg were routed, and the hand was cut off Nuada there, Nuada's druid, that is Cé, went to see the slaughter, whereupon he rushed in lunacy and red-madness towards the south-east, and ceased not from the madness until he came to the cairn of Cor Slieve, and

lying down beside a heap of stones upon the plain, a deep sleep fell upon him, and the lake burst up around him, so that he was drowned, and therefore, it is from him that the lake is called Lough Key." So Gilla Isa M'Firbis informs us in a MS. written about the year 1416. Existing memorials prove the reality of the battles of Moytura, but the chronicler probably made a mistake in calling it Moytura of Cong, instead of North Moytura, from the site of which, on the shores of Lough Arrow, Lough Key is distant about five miles to the south-east, whereas Moytura of Cong is more than fifty miles from Lough Key, and in quite a different direction.

According to the geologists, however, as represented by Professor Hull, the latest and best authority, the lake basin was excavated, partly by the erosion of the glacier stream from the neighbouring mountains, which are exactly in the axis of the great central snow-field of Ireland, and partly by the solution of its carboniferous limestone bed under the continuous action of running water.¹

The comparative quiet and security which the islands of Lough Key afforded in turbulent times to persons anxious to shun the world, attracted solitaries even from the earliest Christian ages. Inis Mac Nerinn was chosen by St. Columba as the site of a monastery which flourished down to the thirteenth century, if not later. In these annals, under date of the year 1230, is recorded the death of "Murrough O'Gormally, Prior of the Regles, i.e., the Abbey church of Inis Mac Nerinn, the most learned and devout man that was in the province of Connaught."

But the fame of Inis Mac Nerinn was about this time eclipsed by the kindred institution on Trinity Island. A monastery was founded there so early as the year 700, but it seems to have fallen into decay during the turbulent times of the Danish invasions, until, under the patronage of the M'Dermotts, it was restored to more than its ancient glory in the early part of the thirteenth century. A word about this family, whose history is so intimately connected with the antiquities of Lough Key.

¹ Professor Hull does not say this of Lough Key, but it may be inferred from his reasoning. See his "Physical Geography and Geology of Ireland,"

The M'Dermotts are descended from Teige of the Three Towers, a king of Connaught, who died in the year 954. From Maelruanaidh Mor, son of Teige, they take their tribe name of Mulroony, and from Diarmid, fifth in descent from the former, who died in 1159, they derive the family name of M'Dermott. The M'Dermotts were princes of Moylurg, Airteach, and Tir-Tuathail, that is, the entire of Northern Roscommon from Lough Gara to Lough Allen, and also of the neighbouring barony of Tirerrill, in the county Sligo. The district anciently and still known amongst the people as Airteach, is incorrectly set down on the map annexed to Mr. Prendergast's "Cromwellian Settlement," as if it were the north-eastern extremity of the county Roscommon. But Airteach really lay along the southern shores of Lough Gara, and included the present parish of Tibohine. The chief residence of the M'Dermotts was on a small island near Rockingham House, now called Castle Island. A portion of the old castle still remains, and a new wing was added, not many years ago, by the late Earl of Kingston—the whole forming a very picturesque feature in the landscape. But, in the twelfth century, the edifice seems to have been constructed of perishable materials, for, under date of the year 1184, we find this entry : " The Rock of Loch Cé was burned by lightning, i.e., the very magnificent, kingly residence of Muinter Maelruanaidh ; six or seven score of distinguished persons were destroyed, along with fifteen men of the race of kings and chieftains "—all either drowned or burnt. The M'Dermotts seem to have had their full share in the wild work of burning, pillage, and mutual slaughter, which weakened the strength of the native chieftains and left them a comparatively easy prey to the grasping " Foreigner." But, at the same time, it must be confessed that few, if any, of the Celtic dynasts were more distinguished for munificent liberality in founding and endowing religious houses, for their enlightened patronage of learned men, and for their loyal adherence through good and ill to their faith and to their country. There was no religious house in Connaught, few, it is said, in Europe, that could rival the great Cistercian Abbey of Boyle in wealth and architectural beauty. Its noble ruins still remain to be seen near Boyle, on the left bank of

the river, and, carefully preserved, although by alien hands, bear eloquent testimony to the faith and munificence of its princely founders. Both shared the same fate—the abbey as well as the family who founded and endowed it ; their vast possessions were confiscated, and divided chiefly between the families of King and Coote, the former taking Moylurg, the latter Tir-Tuathail, since called Cootehall. A member of the King family still ¹ retains the Rockingham estates, and his representative position is sufficient evidence of his popularity in the district ; but the Cootes have long since disappeared from Cootehall, and no one who knows their history will regret their fate. When Heber M'Mahon, the gallant soldier-bishop of Clogher, was taken prisoner after the defeat of the Northern Confederates on the shores of Lough Swilly, in the year 1650, he was confined for some time in Enniskillen. Major King, the officer in charge, treated his prisoner with the greatest kindness and consideration, paying him frequent visits, and alleviating in every way the rigour of his captivity. He also wrote a letter to his superior officer, Sir Charles Coote, urging him to save the bishop's life. Coote replied that he should be hanged forthwith, and ordered King to execute the bloody decree. A second time he wrote to Coote *beseeching* him to save the bishop's life, and commute the sentence ; he only received an angry reply ordering him to hang the " popish bishop " on the spot. King, unable to save him, procured a priest to administer the last sacraments, and then rode away from Enniskillen, leaving to others the execution of Coote's atrocious sentence, which the honest soldier could not prevent by his influence, and would not sanction by his presence.

But the old monastery on Trinity Island is by far the most interesting of the ancient monuments of Lough Key. It would indeed be impossible to select a more suitable site for a religious house, combining with perfect security the solitude of monastic seclusion, and all the charms of rural scenery. The little island on which the monastery was built, not more than an acre in extent, is within a quarter of a mile of the land, surrounded by the sheltering of a quiet bay, and was thus near

¹ This article appeared in the *Irish Monthly* for May, 1878.

enough for convenience, and yet far enough for safety, in those turbulent times when a hosting of the foe pillaged or burned the monasteries, as well as everything else they could lay hold of in an enemy's territory. A belt of planting runs round the margin of the island, leaving in the centre a gently sloping lawn of richest green, planted here and there with tall, flowering shrubs, through whose blossomed boughs the tourist first perceives the old gray walls of the ruined monastery. The church was a plain rectangle, more than a hundred feet long, and twenty-two in breadth, having no pretensions to the architectural grandeur of its great Cistercian neighbour; yet it seems to have been regarded as a holier and more cherished shrine. The side walls and eastern gable still remain standing; this gable is pierced with a beautiful lancet-headed altar-window, supported on stone mullions, and deeply splayed. On the gospel side of the high altar there was a small sacristy opening on the choir through a low-arched doorway; on the opposite side, at right angles to the church, ran a large building containing the kitchen, refectory, and seven or eight little cells for the canons. There is at present no trace of a cloister; in fact, the entire island was a cloister, and no architect ever designed a finer one, if the same shady walks, canopied by the interlacing branches, were as beautiful in those old times as they are at present. An air of holy stillness breathes all around, and clings, like the ivy, to the mossy, mouldering walls. Insensibly the mind wanders backward, and memory, "stealing fire from the fountains of the past," repeoples this little island with its ancient tenants, the white-robed canons of Premonstré, patiently transcribing our old MSS. in yonder ruined cells, walking silent and serenely-browed around the island's narrow circuit, or chanting their matin orisons in harmony with the wavelets that murmured on the shore. Thus they passed the even tenor of their blameless lives—

"And so kept fair, through faith and prayer,
A virgin heart in work and will."

We wonder will it ever again come to pass that these island shrines will be once more tenanted by holy solitaries? And yet, methinks, there are even now many who would gladly

exchange the smoke, and dust, and bustle of the city, for these bright and pure abodes of ancient holiness.

This monastery of the Holy Trinity, although founded so early as the eighth century, owes its great fame to Clarus Mac Mailin, Archdeacon of Elphin. This distinguished man, who so well deserved the name of *Clarus*, was a member of the learned family of the O'Maolconrys, or Conrys simply, as they are now called, who were the hereditary ollaves of the Sil-Muiredhaigh, the royal tribe of Connaught. He refounded, in 1215, this monastery, under the invocation of the Holy Trinity, for Canons of the Order of Premonstré. This reformed branch of the great Augustinian Order was instituted, in 1120, by St. Norbert, who founded the first house at Premonstré, in France, whence the order derives its name. Our annalists say that this institution on Trinity Island was the first house of the Order in Ireland: it certainly was the mother-house of several affiliated monasteries. In 1250, shortly before his death, we find the following entry: "The White Canons of the Premonstré Order were taken by Clarus Mac Mailin, a short time before Christmas, from Trinity Island in Lough Key, to Trinity Island in Lough Uachtair in Breifne, and he established the canons of the order there through the permission of Cathal O'Reilly, who granted it *in puram et perpetuam clemosinam in honore S. Trinitatis*." Anno 1251, the Annals of his own Lough Key give the following touching record of his life and death: "Clarus Mac Mailin, archidiaconus Oilfennensis, vir providus et discretus, qui carnem suam jejuniis et orationibus macerabat, qui pauperes et orphanos defendebat; qui patientiam et coronam observabat; qui persecutionem a multis propter justitiam patiebatur; venerabilis fundator monasteriorum S. Trinitatis per totam Hiberniam, et specialiter fundator monasterii S. Trinitatis apud Loch Cé, ubi locum sibi sepulturæ elegit, ibidem in Christo quievit Sabbato Dominicæ Pentecostes; cujus animæ propitiatur Deus omnipotens in cælo cui ipse servivit in terra; in cujus honore ecclesiam de Rinduin (St. John's, Lough Ree) monasterium S. Trinitatis apud Loch Uachtair, ecclesiam S. Trinitatis apud Ath-Moighe (Killamoy, county Sligo), et ecclesiam S. Trinitatis apud Cill-Rais, (Kilross, county Sligo), ædificavit."

This is the longest piece of Latin in the Annals ; the writer evidently thought the life and death of the great Clarus of Trinity Island too important a matter to be recorded, like other events, in the spoken language. It has been said that Clarus Mac Mailin was Bishop of Kilmore, but there is no evidence to support that assertion. He is not mentioned as such by Ware, nor by the Four Masters, nor in these Annals ; and if it were true, it is not likely that the scribe who penned the foregoing eulogium would forget to mention it. This Clarus was a man deservedly esteemed both by the English and Irish. Anno 1231 we have this curious entry : “ Dionysius O’Mordha (O’Moore), Bishop of Oilfinn, after resigning his bishopric with a view to ending his life on Trinity Island, in Loch Cé, through love for God and for Clarus Mac Mailin, Archdeacon of Oilfinn, and for the Order of the Canons of the same place, XVIII. Kalendas Januarii in eadem insula quievit in Christo.” This O’Moore had been previously Abbot of Boyle, yet he preferred a grave in Trinity Island to a resting-place in the noble cloisters of his own abbey. In 1235, it is recorded how the “ Foreigners ” of Erinn, and the Justiciary, Maurice Fitzgerald, after he had captured the Port of the Rock of Lough Key, “ afforded a general protection and a friendly shelter to Clarus Mac Mailin, and to the Canons of the Trinity on the Island ; and the Justiciary himself, and the chiefs of the Foreigners, went to see that place, and to pray there, and to show respect to it in honour of the Holy Trinity.” And when the Foreigners captured the Rock of Lough Key, and were afterwards driven out by the M’Dermotts, they fled to Trinity Island with their boats in order to place themselves under the protection of Clarus Mac Mailin, who had them safely conveyed away. No doubt, it was in gratitude for this signal service that the “ Hospital of Sligo was given, in 1242 by the Justiciary to Clarus Mac Mailin, in honour of the Holy Trinity.”

Clarus dearly loved Trinity Island, where he selected the place of his burial. There his father, who in his old age became a monk and abbot of Inis Mac Nerinn, was buried ; there his dear friend O’Moore, the Bishop of Elphin, was buried ; and there a host of saints and scholars made choice of the

“place of their resurrection.” But the pilgrim will seek in vain for any trace of their resting-place. Some forty years ago their bones were dug up, their graves were levelled, and flowering shrubs planted on the holy ground, in order to remove from view the memorials of the dead, and make Trinity Island a more pleasant spot for aristocratic pic-nics. The noble peer, who was responsible for this profanation, made many improvements about Rockingham ; but we cannot reckon this amongst the number. It is true, indeed, that the bones were carefully reinterred at the other extremity of the Island, but that spot also was planted, and there is now no possibility of identifying it. We wonder did his lordship ever read the epitaph on Shakespeare’s tomb :—

“ Good friend, for Jesu’s sake forbear,
To dig the dust enclosed here ;
Bless’d be he who spares these stones,
And curs’d be he who moves my bones.”

There is some doubt as to the place where the *Annals of Loch Cé* were compiled ; but as scholars like Eugene O’Curry and John O’Donovan differ on this point, and Mr. Hennessy cannot quite agree with either, we shall not hazard an opinion of our own. We shall, however, state first what is certain, and then try to explain what is doubtful, concerning the history of these Annals.

There is only one MS. copy known to exist at present, and that is in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. It is written on small folio vellum, for the most part in an accurate and beautiful style of penmanship, and contains at present ninety-nine folios. The first few pages have been much defaced by damp and exposure to the rough grasp of unclean fingers, but they are, at least partially, restored on some inserted sheets of papers. In its present state the MS. begins at the year 1014 with a very full and interesting account of the battle of Clontarf, and ends at the year 1571. There are two chasms in the entries, one from 1138 to 1170—a most important period—and another from 1316 to 1462, where 142 years are omitted. In 1849, Eugene O’Curry accidentally discovered in the British Museum a fragment, which he asserts is a continuation of the *Annals of Loch Cé*, but Mr. Hennessy maintains that

it is no such thing, inasmuch as the contents of the fragment are partially contained in the MS. of which it is said to be a part, and the character and size of the vellum in the original and the alleged fragment are quite different; although the latter was undoubtedly written for the same person (Brian M'Dermott) and, at least partially, by the same scribe.

The MS. in Trinity College is lettered on the back as "*Continuatio Tighernachi*," but all the authorities admit this is a mistake, as it neither is, nor was ever meant to be a continuation of Tighernach, whose work comes down to 1088, whereas this begins at 1013 and in quite a different style. The MS. was undoubtedly written between the years 1580 and 1588 for Brian M'Dermott, Chief of Moylurg. In 1592, an entry made by a new scribe records the death of this Brian M'Dermott: "M'Dermott of Magh-Luirg, Brian son of Rory, son of Teige M'Dermott, died in the month of November; and the death of this Brian is the more to be lamented because there was no other like him of the Clann Maelruanaidh." He may be regarded as the last independent chief of the ancient line who held the Rock of Lough Key. In 1648, the Book was still in possession of the M'Dermotts, for a marginal entry records in that year "the death of Hugh, son of Brian, son of Rory M'Dermott, at Grangenamanagh," county Roscommon, on the 14th March.

On an inserted leaf of paper under date of 1698, the following entry occurs: "I am this day at Baile-an-Chairn Oillthrialla, 10th November, 1698. John Mac Namee." This place is now called Heapstown, the literal translation of the Irish name, which the place received from the huge cairn of stones raised over the grave of Oillil, brother of Nial of the Nine Hostages, from whom the barony of Tirerrill, county Sligo, derives its present name. There are still, or were until quite recently, a few families of the M'Dermotts remaining near Heapstown, into whose custody this volume had probably passed at this time, when John Mac Namee, a travelling shanachie, inscribed his name. From the M'Dermotts of Heapstown the MS. passed into the congenial hands of Mr. John Conry (a descendant of the O'Mulconrys, hereditary ollaves of the O'Conors), as we learn from Dr. Nicholson's "*Irish Historical Library*,"

published in 1724. From Conry it passed to Dr. John Fergus, at whose book sale it was purchased, in 1766, by Dr. Leland, who placed it in the Library of Trinity College, where it still remains. Dr. Nicholson, however, calls it a "Copy of the Annals of the old Abbey of Inis Mac Nerinn in Loghkea," which piece of information he had probably from Mr. John Conry himself.

This MS., as we have said, was written for Brian M'Dermott, and was probably a compilation from older MSS. ; the principal scribe was one Philip Badley, as the following marginal entry at the end of 1061 shows: "I am fatigued from Brian M'Dermott's Book, anno Domini, 1580—I am Philip Badley." Eugene O'Curry conjectures that this Philip was a member of the learned family of the O'Duignans of Kilronan, who were hereditary bards and historians of Moylurg and Conmaicne, as many entries in these Annals show. Kilronan, in whose old churchyard Carolan is buried, was in the ancient Tir-Tuathail, not far from the present village of Keadue. Under date of the year 1588, he says: "I am Philip who wrote this on the day of the festival of St. Brendan in particular, and Cluain I Bhraoin is my place." This Cluain I Bhraoin is in the parish of Ardcarna, and in the territory of Moylurg, not far from the southern shore of Lough Key. It is clear that Cloonybrien, as it is now called, was then the residence of the O'Duignans, for there is another entry under date of the year 1581 to this effect: "Fercaodagh O'Duignan, son of Fergal, son of Philip, died at Cluain I Bhraoin." So there can be no doubt as to the time, and place of writing, and the principal scribe engaged in the composition of this Book.

Still the authorities are by no means agreed as to its identity and appropriate name. Sir James Ware had a volume of annals which he called "*Pars Annalium Cœnobii S. Trin. de Loghkea*," extending from 1249 to 1381; but Eugene O'Curry denies their identity with the present volume. Dr. Todd and Dr. John O'Donovan thought the MS. in Trinity College was a copy of the "*Book of the Annals of Kilronan*," which the Four Masters, in their preface, tell us they made use of in their compilation, and, accordingly, they said this volume ought to be called the "*Book of the Annals of Kilronan*." Eugene

O'Curry, without denying that this book may have been copied from the Annals, or "Book of Kilronan," says that it ought to be called, as Dr. Nicholson called it on the authority of John Conry, the "*Annals of Inis Mac Nerinn in Lough Cé*," or simply, the *Annals of Loch Cé*, and his authority has prevailed. It is not unlikely that the original materials of the volume were collected, first in the older monastery of Inis Mac Nerinn, and afterwards in Trinity Island. The compilers were certainly members of the O'Duignan family, whose special duty it was to collect and preserve the records of their patrons, the M'Dermotts; and, no doubt, many of that learned family were canons of Trinity Island—a monastery which was specially under the protection of the M'Dermotts. That Brian M'Dermott, for whom the Annals were written or copied, calls himself *uachtharan*, or lay superior, or protector of the Trinity Island Monastery, on which, he tells us, he put a new roof in the year 1577. Hence, as might be expected, this "Book of Annals" is particularly rich in details relating to the Province of Connaught, and especially to the history of the M'Dermotts, the O'Conors, and their neighbours. Few, indeed, of the centres contained in the *Annals of Loch Cé* are omitted by the Four Masters—a member of the O'Duignan family was one of them—but they have been so curtailed as to lose much of their historical and topographical value. Besides, these Annals have many important entries found nowhere else.

Whether or not the *Annals of Loch Cé* have any connection with Trinity Island, there can be little doubt that the so-called *Annals of Boyle* were written and preserved in the monastery of that island. This volume, at present in the British Museum, has, since Usher's time, been known as the *Annals of Boyle*, but that designation is by no means an appropriate one. At the close of the sixteenth century, it was in the possession of the same Brian M'Dermott for whom the *Annals of Loch Cé* were written; many of the entries are in his handwriting, and in the MS. itself there is a marginal entry in which it is called the "Historical Book of the Island of Saints." Now, as Eugene O'Curry has pointed out, it cannot be the Island of Saints in Lough Ree that is meant, for the

Book of Annals belonging to that island has been ascertained to be quite a different volume. It must, therefore, he contends, be the Island of Saints in Lough Key, and he quotes the authority of the late Mr. Denis Kelly to the effect, that there is an island in Lough Key known as *Oilean na Naomh*, or Saints' Island. But from inquiries made on the spot, I could not ascertain that any island in Lough Key goes by that name at present, so that by the "Saints' Island" the writer in the Annals must have meant Trinity Island, which is expressly called the "Abode of the Saints," and was, no doubt, frequently called the Island of the Saints in old times. We may, therefore, safely conclude that the proper title is not, what is written in English hand on the fly-leaf, "*Annales Monasterii in Buellio in Hibernia*," but the "Historical Book of Trinity Island."

The position of the ollaves at the end of the sixteenth century, if we may judge from their complaints recorded in these Annals, does not seem to have been by any means an enviable one. Their unhappy lot strongly reminds us of the privations endured by the literary denizens of Grub-street in the days of Savage and Johnson. "I am weary," says one, "of the work of Brian M'Dermott." Another scribe makes the bitter complaint that he had to give up writing for want of his dinner—*Scurim do thacu pruinne*. A third cautions the reader not to pronounce the last letter, which he had inadvertently added to a word, because, he says, "my pulse shrank through excess of labour." Yet, in better days, Brian M'Dermott and his father, Rory, were the generous patrons of poets and scholars. Under date of 1540, it is recorded how "a school invitation was given by Rory, son of Teige, and by his wedded wife, M'William's daughter, the best woman of her own kindred, or of any other family of her time, for distributing various gifts to poets, and ollaves, and men of all other arts." Then follows a long list of all the princes, and nobles, and scholars who came to this school invitation; "for all the poets and ollaves of Erinn came to the seat of hospitality and generosity of the Province of Connaught, i.e., the Rock of the Smooth-flowing Lough Key; and let every one who reads this give a blessing on the souls of this humane

couple." But 1590 was not 1540. In the interval all the vials of God's chastening wrath had been poured out on unhappy Ireland. "Moreover, M'Dermott's country was made a harp without a *ceis*, and a church without an abbot, after the death of Rory M'Dermott (1568); for numerous evils came after his decease, i.e., the ruin and destruction of the power of Clann Maelruanaidh. Their ardour and spirit were blunted, their brughaidhs, and biatachs, and widows, were impoverished; their patrons, and professors, and airchinnechs were expelled; and many of their princes and nobles were annihilated and slain. A general war broke out between Foreigners and Irish, Scotch and Saxon, O'Conors and M'Dermotts, chieftains and people. Moreover, cold and famine, theft and violence, rapine and desecration, illegality and oppression, grew throughout the districts and tribes, and they were all banished and driven, both high and low, to distant foreign territories." This is the language of an eye-witness, that Brian M'Dermott for whom the *Annals of Loch Cé* were written, and surely Bulgaria and Roumelia felt no greater woes than these. Yet we see how, even during these blackest years of poverty, disaster, and disgrace, Irish chieftains patronised, and Irish scholars pursued, the study of our old Celtic records. Our lot has been cast in a happier time; better days have dawned upon us; yet, even now, the generous and the good can learn a lesson from the munificence of our ancient princes, and the heroic zeal and devotion of the holy men who lived and died in those old monasteries whose crumbling ruins still cover the land.

THE PRIEST IN POLITICS.¹

THE question which I propose to discuss to-day is a large, and in some respects, a rather delicate question. My purpose, however, is merely to give what I consider to be sound advice to the young priests of the College and of the Union ; and in so doing I shall be careful to avoid saying anything that would be likely to give reasonable ground of offence to any person either within or without the College. I claim no special authority for my opinions ; they are open to full and free discussion. I only hope that, as I shall confine myself to deducing clear conclusions from what I regard as sound premises, others will do the same, appealing to reason rather than to sentiment or emotion.

I said this question as it stands is a large one. It has a historical aspect reaching back through all the centuries of the Church's history. I have, of course, no intention of discussing it from this point of view ; and shall content myself with observing, what every scholar knows to be true, that the greatest statesmen whom Europe has ever seen were ecclesiastical politicians, and that the story of their lives is the most fascinating amongst the pages of modern history.

Then again, even in the present day, this question presents itself in manifold aspects throughout the Catholic world. It is an urgent and practical question in countries like France, Austria, and Italy, where the Church has long been established ; it demands an answer in Canada and the United States, where no Church is established ; and it must be faced in countries like England, where a schismatical Church is still a powerful State institution, as well as in Ireland, where the long battle for faith and fatherland has developed a religious patriotism, which has become a second nature in every genuine Irish heart. It is manifest from the different conditions of the problem that the same answer cannot be

¹ Paper read at the Maynooth Union on 24th June, 1897.

given to our question in all these cases. Of course, we must confine ourselves to our own time and to our own country.

But, even in our own country, the question has what I may call its hierarchical aspects—and we might discuss the intervention of the Pope, and of the Bishops, either collectively or individually, in Irish politics. Well, my good friends, I am, I hope, too wise a man to discuss these questions on my own responsibility at the present time. I shall confine myself to the humbler but not less useful question of the intervention of the Irish missionary priest in Irish politics—how far it is lawful and desirable, and what rules should be adopted as safeguards against the abuse of such intervention.

To reason securely about questions of this kind, which are not discussed in books—at least in the form needful for us—we must deduce our conclusions from certain definite and well-ascertained principles. We cannot discuss these grave questions in a loose rhetorical fashion, with the undue assumptions and bold assurance of irresponsible writers in newspapers or magazines.

I. Now, first of all, I think I may safely say that, *per se loquendo*, it is no part of a priest's *duty* to intervene at all in purely political questions. By politics of course I mean the practical science of governing the State with a view to promote the temporal well-being of its citizens. The Church has its own end to accomplish; and that is to promote the spiritual or supernatural well-being of its children both here and hereafter. Church and State may help each other indirectly in various ways; but the direct and immediate end of each is, as you know, essentially different—as different as the soul is from the body, as heaven is from earth. Yet soul and body are closely united; and it is oftentimes extremely difficult to discriminate exactly between the functions of the one and the other. You know too that in many cases both must co-operate to produce any useful result. So also is it with the Church and State. There are many functions that under different aspects appertain to both; there are many questions which belong to both tribunals—directly and immediately—because they have directly and immediately both spiritual and temporal effects. These are called

“mixed questions,” and are within the competence both of the spiritual and civil authority, although from different points of view. In one the spiritual, in the other the temporal interest may be predominant ; but still the object in each case will be “ direct ” and distinct from the other. Educational questions, matrimonial laws, poor laws, charitable bequests, and such like belong to this category. The canonists maintain that in the settlement of these questions the Church should be the “ predominant partner.” For the present, however, I shall merely observe that in the settlement of such questions the Church, that is, the pope and the bishop and the priest have a right to speak with authority, and to insist on the recognition of the legitimate claims of their flock by the government of their country, as well as by the politicians of every party. We know that in these kingdoms such sacerdotal interference or dictation, as it is often called, has long been viewed with great jealousy by the Government ; but at the same time great liberty of thought and action is allowed to ecclesiastics, much more, indeed, than they enjoy in the so-called Catholic countries of the Continent. We have poverty in Ireland, and we have grievances ; but we have also freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of combination, freedom of action—and this in itself is a great blessing, which I believe no Catholic Irishman lay or clerical would be willing to barter for the loaves and fishes of a State endowment. In Ireland these questions of mixed politics are manifold and urgent ; and there can be no doubt that the priest untrammelled by dependence on the State, has the right, and oftentimes the urgent duty, of taking a prominent part in their discussion.

II. Secondly, I presume no one will deny to a priest or bishop the right to take an ordinary citizen’s part in the government of the State—that is to have his own opinions on political questions ; to speak them freely to others ; to exercise the franchise according to law ; and to do what any other citizen of his education and position might do in similar circumstances without note or comment. When a man becomes a priest he does not cease to be a citizen ; he must pay his share of the public taxes ; he must be amenable to the laws of the State ;

in this country he enjoys no stipend nor civil privileges whatsoever—if then he has to bear all the burdens he certainly should enjoy all the rights of a citizen. To curtail them in any way, or to impose upon him any civil disabilities whatever, not sanctioned by the Church, is clearly a violation both of civil and religious liberty. It would be simply persecution for conscience sake, differing only in degree from the penal laws of the eighteenth century.

* Therefore, when I say that it is no part of the duty of a priest to intervene in politics, I mean that it is no part of his duty as a priest to take a prominent part in questions purely or primarily political; and no one can lawfully compel him to do so. This proposition is not without its value in practice; and, therefore, I think it important to prove it clearly.

First of all, observe the public life of our Saviour and His Apostles, so far as it is known to us from the New Testament. The years of our Lord's public mission were years of great political excitement in Palestine. In many respects their condition was strikingly like our own; there was a foreign domination, crushing and resistless; there were fervent national aspirations more intense and enduring than ours; there were as many political parties in the country—Romans, Herodians, Pharisees, Sadducees, Zealots, and even *Sicarii*, as the Roman historian calls them. There was also chronic insurrection followed by bloody repression, confiscation, and imprisonment. Not a single element of resemblance is wanting; yet there is no reference to all this in the New Testament, and, so far as we can judge from its pages, our Saviour, as well as His Apostles and disciples, kept completely aloof from all the political movements and parties of the time. Once they put Him a dangerous question in order to compromise Him with one side or the other; but Divine Wisdom baffled them by a brief and simple answer that has so little of local politics in it that it holds good for all time and for all governments: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." If the life of our Saviour is to be the model for a good priest, no one can blame a priest for declining to take a prominent part in

the political struggles of the hour, no matter how the "patriots" may declaim against him.

Again, the treatise, *De Obligationibus Statuum*, sets forth at length the obligations of the priest as such: you know well what they are; but you will search these pages in vain for any reference to the duty of a priest taking any part in the political movements of his time or country.

Not only, indeed, is there no reference to the duty of taking a prominent part in political discussion, but there is what appears to be a very clear counsel, if not a precept, of abstaining from such disturbing occupations. You know the text well—"Nemo militans Deo implicat se negotiis saecularibus, ut ei placeat, cui se probavit."¹ The priest is an officer on active service in the army of Christ, whose kingdom is not of this world. He cannot please his General if he entangles himself too much in worldly affairs; and there are no worldly affairs more engrossing and more distracting than political affairs. I think, therefore, *speaking of the priest in general*, it must be admitted that it is no part of his duty to mix himself up in politics, and that he ought as a rule keep aloof from them as much as possible.

These are, however, general principles applicable to priests at all times, and in all countries; and, like to other general principles, they are liable to be greatly modified in their application by special circumstances. The question then at once arises—are there special circumstances in Ireland which should modify these principles, and which do justify an interference by the clergy of this country in politics that ought not to be tolerated in most other countries? It is quite obvious that this question must be answered in the affirmative; although, in my opinion, these special reasons are by no means so urgent now as they were heretofore.

It is only during this present century that the Irish Catholic clergy began to take a prominent part in Irish politics, and made their influence felt both by friends and foes. During the eighteenth century they were content if they were allowed to live, and they dare not appear as prominent politicians; but as soon as the Catholics got the

franchise their influence at once began to make itself felt. O'Connell organised that influence, and mainly by its leverage he succeeded in winning the civil and religious liberties of Irish Catholics. But it is obvious that the questions of Emancipation, of the Tithes, of the Disestablishment of the Church, of National Education and Proselytizing Schools, were mixed questions, in some of which the religious question was the predominant question. The priest had, as a priest, a perfect right to take a prominent part in the discussion and settlement of all these questions in which the interests of the Church and the salvation of souls were so greatly at stake. In fighting for such things as Emancipation and Catholic Education, he was "*militans Deo*"—acting within the sphere of his duty, and fighting the battles of the Cross. His language might sometimes be violent, and his zeal might outrun discretion, but in the main he was right, his cause was just, and his work was holy. And for the same reason, now or hereafter, the priest and the bishop have a right to intervene prominently in the political discussion of these mixed questions, which no fair-minded man can deny them.

Secondly: In Ireland, owing to its unhappy history, the gentry—that is, the men of landed property, of education, of wealth and social position—who, in other countries, are the natural leaders of the people, were, as a rule, their enemies—hostile in religion, hostile in race, hostile in their sympathies and interests. So the Catholic people, in their legitimate efforts to secure their rights, would be entirely without leaders, at least, in the rural districts, if the priest did not become the guide and shepherd of his people in temporals as well as in spirituals. This is, undoubtedly, the fact; and of itself goes far to justify the political activity of many of the clergy, even in the purely political struggles of the past. And this becomes a still weightier and more urgent reason, when we reflect on the history of the last four hundred years. Soldiers that go through the same prolonged campaigns, sleeping in the same tents at night, making toilsome marches together for many a weary day, fighting shoulder to shoulder against a common foe on a hundred battle-fields, help each other, love each other, and are ready to fight and die for each

other. There is no other comradeship so deep, so close, so enduring ; and such was the comradeship that existed during all the dreadful past between the Irish priests and the Irish people. Together they fought, together they suffered, and together they died. When the dread unhappy night was past and better days began to dawn upon them, could they be indifferent to each other's lot ? It was not in human nature. The *soggarth aroon* could not be expected to stand by indifferent when his people were still engaged in unequal conflict with the historic foe. Theoretically, politics might be no part of his business ; but few men will greatly blame him if he threw in his lot with the oppressed against the oppressor, with the weak against the strong, with the poor against the rich, with the men of his own kith and kin against aliens who spurned his race, his country, and his religion. We must bear in mind also, that although there was a want of competent leaders amongst laymen in the past, this want will scarcely be admitted by the prominent politicians of the present time. They think themselves quite competent to lead the people to victory. Some of them would wish to exclude the clergy altogether from politics, lest they themselves should ever be called to order for their doings. So long as the priest is ready to collect money for their needs, and is subservient to their views, they will tolerate him, and if they think him greedy of praise, they will eulogize him ; but if ever he ventures to question the propriety of their acts, they will at once tell him to give up politics and mind his parish. This school of politicians has come to the front of late years ; and although they are not gaining ground, their existence cannot be ignored, nor are they confined to any one political party.

These reasons, which I have thus briefly indicated, were imperative in the past ; and, although no longer so cogent, still, to some extent, they do exist, and, in my opinion, do justify an Irish missionary priest in taking a part in Irish politics, which could not, and ought not, be tolerated elsewhere. But such intervention in these times must be judicious and well regulated ; otherwise it would certainly be very mischievous to the highest interests of our Catholic

people, and, most of all, to the priests themselves. The following practical rules will, I think, be generally admitted as just and reasonable ; and, if observed, will be efficacious in preventing the evils that sometimes result from the unwise intervention of priests in politics.

Now, the first rule I would lay down is this, and I think few will be found to question its wisdom—that young priests for several years after their ordination should not be allowed or encouraged to take an active part in politics. The reason is clear. They have, at first, neither the experience, the prudence, nor the knowledge of the world necessary to make them safe and trustworthy guides for others in political questions. Of course, many of them think they have, and that the old fogies are altogether behind the age. And this is particularly true in the case of those young men who have not even knowledge enough to doubt of the wisdom of their own proceedings. Yet, where would they get political knowledge ? Not surely whilst they were school-boys scrambling through the Latin grammar ; nor in the seminary where they had quite enough to do to master the Intermediate Course ; nor, yet here in Maynooth, for although you have many Chairs in Maynooth, you have no Chair of Politics that I know of ; and Social Ethics can only be very lightly touched on, if it is discussed at all. The young priest is, no doubt, an official teacher of the people in matters of faith and morals, but that subject he is supposed to have mastered ; he follows, too, in beaten paths, and he preaches under the supervision of his parish priest and of his bishop. As a moral teacher he is sound enough—he cannot well go astray ; but as a political teacher he is almost a child, and sometimes worse than a child, for nobody minds what a child says, but what the priest says is always listened to, and sometimes very freely and very justly criticized. It is folly, then, for a young priest to take a header into politics, and set up to be a leader and a guide in matters of which he really knows little or nothing. Then, again, the young priest ought to be a man of prayer, of study, of self-restraint, if not of self-denial. But how can he be this, if he launches his barque at once into the stormy sea of politics, where there is so much commotion, so many dangers,

so many allurements to dissipation of mind ? I know from experience what frequently happens in such cases. The ardent politician will compose political harangues instead of sermons ; his time is more given to the reading of newspapers than of the Scriptures ; his hours grow late and irregular ; he is often absent from home when he is wanted ; the excitement and dust of the political arena make him thirsty ; and his associates are by no means always safe and edifying companions. I do not care now to describe all the evils that sometimes follow from such habits ; but I will say this, that I have known several young priests who have greatly fallen away from their high estate, because in times of excitement they devoted themselves too soon and too earnestly to politics. My dear young friends listening to me, you are the rising hope of the Irish Church, our joy and our crown, and therefore it is I implore you to take no prominent part in politics before you have spent seven or eight years on the mission. It will then be quite time enough.

The second rule is that, no matter what be the age, experience, and authority of the priest who intervenes in politics, he must never forget that he is a priest, and that his language, his conduct, and his demeanour must never be unworthy of the dignity and sanctity of the priestly character. He cannot put off his priesthood as he would put off a suit of old clothes. He cannot be one man in the pulpit and another on the platform. He is always the ambassador of Christ -- "*pro Christo legatione jungimur*" ¹—and he cannot put aside this representative character. He should neither speak, nor write, nor countenance abusive or violent or seditious language, which even a layman who wishes to be regarded as a gentleman would never think of using. Whatever others may do, there is a special obligation on the priest of observing moderation in his conduct and language—" *Modestia vestra nota sit omnibus hominibus*" ²—in things political as in everything else. Besides in political matters it is surely just and proper to allow to others, both in thought and action, the same liberty as you claim for yourselves ; and it is extremely important to be always on good terms with your parishioners.

¹ 2 Cor. v. 20.

² Philipp. iv. 5.

And surely, in adopting political means of action, the priest can lend no countenance to methods or means of even doubtful morality. He is nothing if he is not a teacher of public morality ; and if his conduct as a politician belies his teachings as a priest, the sooner he gives up preaching on the subject the better.

The third rule, too, cannot I think, be questioned. It is this :—that no priest should allow his pursuit of politics at any time to cause him to neglect any of his ecclesiastical duties. Politics is an engrossing pursuit, and sometimes greatly disturbs the mind. The more reason the ecclesiastical politician has to be on his guard. It is all very well to win applause on public platforms, to fight the battles of the people, to be called an eloquent and patriotic priest in the newspapers ; but, as I laid down in the beginning, politics is no part of the duty of a priest, and can never be alleged before God or man as an excuse for neglecting any part of his ecclesiastical duties. These duties in this country are manifold and laborious ; if they are faithfully performed they leave very little time for other occupations, and, moreover, they demand the personal presence and constant vigilance of the priest. The place for the priest is the church, the school, the sick-room—there he is at home, there lies the sphere of his duties. It cannot be denied that frequent attendance at political meetings outside his parish, conferences with political leaders, letter-writing to the newspapers are likely of their own nature to interfere, to some extent, with the perfect discharge of parochial duty. A priest, therefore, who takes a prominent part in politics must be always on his guard lest his sermons, his sick calls, his schools, or any other of his functions should suffer any detriment thereby. “ *Tu vero vigila, in omnibus labora, opus fac evangelistae, ministerium tuum imple.*” ¹ It is not easy to combine this vigilance, this manifold labour, this work of an evangelist, who fulfils all the duties of his ministry, with the distracting cares of an active political career.

A special word of caution is necessary with reference to parliamentary elections. The law of the land is extremely jealous of the interference of the clergy in parliamentary elections ; and all the more so since the freedom of the

¹ 2 Tim. iv. 5.

voters from other influences has, to a great extent, been secured by the protection of the Ballot Act. So long as the Catholic freeholders were the slaves of their landlords, and were notoriously coerced to vote in many cases against their consciences, the influence of the priest was a just and necessary counterpoise to the tyranny of the landlords. But that excuse no longer exists. The law adopts the most elaborate precautions to secure the perfect freedom of the voter and the secrecy of his vote. It is scarcely to be wondered at if in such a state of things, the law is also anxious to protect the voter against spiritual as well as against temporal intimidation of every kind. The celebrated judgment of Justice Fitzgerald is neither altogether logical nor consistent with itself; but substantially it asserts a sound principle that, as a rule, neither spiritual or temporal rewards should be promised, nor, on the other hand, should spiritual or temporal coercion be resorted to in order to influence the choice of a voter in favour of a particular candidate. I am not disposed to quarrel with the substantial justice of this decision. The learned Judge declared indeed that the Catholic priest "may counsel, advise, recommend, entreat, and point out the true line of moral duty, and explain why one candidate should be preferred to another, and may, if he think fit, throw the whole weight of his character into the scale, but he may not appeal to the fears, terrors, or superstitions of those he addresses." I think if the priest is free to do what is set forth in the first part of this sentence, he will gain little by trying to do what the Judge refers to in the last clause. The main point is that as a priest he should be free to point out the true line of moral duty, to give his reasons, and to exhort his people to follow that line of duty. In my opinion, that is quite enough for him—at least on all ordinary occasions. No doubt a great crisis might arise, the gravest religious interests might be at stake, and a priest might feel it his duty, not only to point out the line of moral duty, but also to tell his flock that to ignore it would be a sin, and possibly in certain extreme cases a grave sin against God and His Church. And as the late Dr. O'Hanlon explained in reply to the Maynooth Commission of 1853, if a man declares

his fixed purpose of doing what is beyond doubt a grave sin, the priest would be not only justified, but bound to refuse him absolution if he came in such circumstances to confession. The case, as Dr. O'Hanlon said, can rarely occur ; but I think he was logical and courageous in speaking of it as a possible case, and pointing out the priest's duty, no matter what view the law might take of his conduct. It is rarely, however, that such a case could occur ; if it did occur, the priest should consult his bishop ; and I believe the bishop would be very slow, indeed, in condemning the act of an individual voter as a mortal sin, or refusing him absolution, especially when the voter was acting in good faith, although from a perverse and mistaken view of his duty in the case.

My own opinion is that, at least in ordinary cases, there is no need for the priest to come into collision with the law, and that a cautious priest who weighs his words may, without violating the law, do all that his duty requires and exercise far more influence in the long run than if he were rashly to violate the rule of law as laid down by the judges.

Another thing I wish to observe is, that the pulpit or altar is hardly ever the place for political harangues. Of course, in the discussion of "the mixed questions," where the spiritual interests of the people are quite as much at stake, and perhaps more so, than their temporal interests, the priest has a perfect right to speak about such subjects, and to point out the line of conscientious duty which all true Catholics ought to pursue. I speak now only of temporal questions, which effect directly only the material interests of the people.

As a rule the pulpit is no place for the discussion of such questions, however useful or important in themselves. They are still "profane questions," and cannot with propriety be discussed in the House of God. Moreover, even good Catholics greatly differ in their opinions on such questions ; and it is obviously improper to force them to listen to the expression of opinions which are distasteful to them, when they come to the Church to worship God. The natural consequence of such conduct must be to keep them away altogether from the Church, or compel them to go elsewhere.

"*Speak thou the things that become sound doctrine. . . .*" says St. Paul to Titus, "*the sound word that cannot be blamed, that he who is on the contrary part may be afraid, having no evil to say of us.*"¹

Then, again, if a priest of prudence and experience feels it his duty to take an active part in political discussion, he will not set up for himself, in opposition to the views of his brother priests and of his ecclesiastical superiors. He may possibly be right in his opinions; but the public expression of them in such circumstances is likely to do more harm than good. The strength of the Church lies in the discipline and union of the clergy. When they feel it necessary to range themselves publicly in opposite camps it is, in my opinion, far better for the minority to abstain from politics altogether. As I have already pointed out, no superior can compel them to become active politicians; hence, if any priest does not like the views of the majority or of the bishop, he has still the alternative of keeping silent and attending to his parish—a safer and, generally speaking, far more profitable work for himself and for his people.

To sum up—I say that no priest is bound to become an active or prominent politician, and that, *per se loquendo*, it is rather the duty of the "man of God" to abstain from the distractions and entanglements of political life. Still in this country there are many questions discussed in the press, and in parliament in which the spiritual interests of the people are at stake, and in the discussion of which a priest may take a prominent and a useful part. Even in purely political questions also, where the interests of his flock are at stake, an able and experienced priest may feel himself called upon to help his flock in the unequal conflict between the privileged classes on the one side, and the poor oppressed people on the other. But even in such circumstances he must never forget that he is a priest, and he should so regulate his language, his conduct and his demeanour as to bring no discredit on his ministry, and give no reasonable ground of offence to any man whatsoever. "*Nemini dantes ullam offensionem ut non vituperetur ministerium nostrum.*"²

¹ Titus, ii, 1; 8.

² 2 Cor. v. 3.

GERALD BARRY.

AN HISTORICAL STUDY.

ON Thursday, April 25th, 1185, Prince John, Earl of Morton, youngest son of Henry II., landed at Waterford, attended by a gallant train of nobles, knights, and ecclesiastics. Amongst the ecclesiastics was one who held the high and responsible position of tutor, secretary, and adviser to the young prince, then in his nineteenth year. This was Sylvester Giraldus de Barri, who in one of his books has described himself as a literary man of studious and observant habits. He was the first Englishman who wrote a formal treatise on Ireland and its inhabitants, and his writings have exercised a very baneful influence on this country. He struck the key-note and almost every Englishman writing about Ireland, since his time down to Mr. Froude, has piped in concert. "Not one of them can be accepted as a truthful guide on Irish history; they either suppress the truth, or state falsehood, exaggerate what is bad, or extenuate what is good." We have lately made a *post-mortem* examination of Gerald Barry, the first of the tribe, and we will communicate the results thereof to the reader. His is a typical case of that organic disease which he transmitted to his literary posterity.

De Barri came of an illustrious race. His maternal grandfather was Gerald of Windsor, Constable of Pembroke, who gave name and origin to the princely line of the Geraldines. His grandmother was the famous Nesta, daughter of Rhys, and sister of Griffeth, princess of South Wales, the most beautiful, but, by no means, the most virtuous woman of her time. By her husband, Gerald of Windsor, she had four children known to history,—three sons, William, Maurice, and David Fitzgerald, and one daughter, Angharat, who became wife of William de Barri, and mother of Gerald.

In those days there were only two professions, chivalry and the church. Gerald's elder brothers, William and Robert, chose the former; they were amongst the first of the Anglo-

Norman invaders of Ireland, and won for their descendants the fairest plains in Desmond from Buttevant¹ to Barrymore—the former tells their war-cry, the latter bears their name. He himself assumed the cassock, and became, not, indeed, one of the best, but certainly one of the most remarkable ecclesiastics of his time.

From his youth Gerald appears to have devoted himself with great assiduity to his studies. His voluminous writings show that he was an accomplished scholar, well acquainted with the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the entire range of the Latin classics. He taught the *Trivium* at Paris with great applause, was a ready writer, an able speaker, and an indefatigable student. Even when he spent the day in travelling he devoted the night to study. The intrigues and distractions of a court could not divert his attention from his books. He was, withal, a great traveller, and journeyed through England, France, and Ireland—as much of the latter as an Englishman then dare attempt—and made three journeys to Rome to maintain his election to St. David's, not to speak of a fourth visit, which he afterwards paid as a pilgrim.

With talent, ambition, and family influence, it might have been expected that Gerald would have risen high in the Church; yet he never became a bishop, and, from what we know of his character, we may safely conclude that the Church was no loser thereby. He tells us himself, if he can be believed, that he was offered the sees of Ferns, Ossory, and Leighlin, as well as the archbishopric of Cashel, not to speak of two sees in Wales, the see of Lincoln, and even a cardinal's hat—all of which, however, he declined from motives more or less creditable to himself. His great ambition was to be elevated to the see of St. David's, his native diocese; but that ambition was doomed to disappointment. The canons, indeed, elected him on two different occasions, in 1176, and again in 1189, after his return from Ireland; but the English court and clergy, from motives of policy, persistently opposed his elevation. Gerald was half a Welshman—his usual name is Giraldus Cambrensis, Gerald the Welshman—hence, neither the jealous

¹ Buttevant takes its name from "Boutez-en-avant," or "Go-a-head," the war-cry of the Barrys.

tyrant who martyred St. Thomas of Canterbury a few years before, for vindicating the liberties of the Church, nor his graceless sons, would sanction his election. They feared his ambition and patriotism might prompt him to reassert the ancient metropolitan rights of St. David's, if not the independence of Wales. Although there is every reason to fear his motives were not the purest, still we think his long and gallant struggle against court influence to secure freedom of election was by far the most creditable portion of his career. But his efforts were all in vain. Although he stoutly maintained his election with tongue, pen, and purse, in England, in Normandy, and in Rome, he was defeated, and was forced to content himself with his archdeaconry of St. David's, where, however, he does not seem to have spent much of his time. The court-fool often amused the courtiers at his expense. "Master Gerald, will you accept the see of Ferns?"—"Nolo." "Of Ossory?"—"Nolo." "Of Leighlin?"—"Nolo." "The archbishopric of Cashel?"—"Nolo." But in the end he added: "the see of St. David's?" and roared out amidst general laughter, "Volo."

Disappointed in his ambition, Gerald devoted the remainder of his life down to his death, about 1220, at the age of 72 to the production and correction of his numerous works. They have lately¹ been accurately edited and printed, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, in seven large volumes. In the catalogue of his writings, we find a treatise entitled, *De Instructione Principis* which he wrote for the benefit of his royal pupil. What share Gerald himself, or this book of his, may have had in the formation of John's character, it is not easy to determine; but certainly his pupil does the master no credit, for a more cruel, cowardly, and mean-spirited tyrant is not to be found in the long list of English sovereigns.

The fifth volume of this new edition of the works of Gerald Barry contains his two Irish treatises, the *Topography*, and the *Expugnatio*, carefully edited by an English clergyman, the Rev. J. F. Dimock, Rector of Barnsburgh in Yorkshire. These are by far the best known, and, in a certain sense, the most valuable of the works of Giraldus, and to them we must

¹ This article appeared in the *Irish Monthly* for March, 1878.

give our exclusive attention ; but, before we criticise the historian, let us strive to ascertain the character of the man. Fortunately, he has left us abundant materials for forming an estimate of his character, in a treatise, *De Rebus a se Gestis* ; and that estimate would most certainly be an inadequate one, if inordinate vanity and self-conceit were not set down as his ruling passion. We have high authority for the statement, that “ knowledge puffeth up,” and, if Gerald had the knowledge, it cannot be denied that he was proportionately inflated. He coolly declares that he was the only man in England then living worthy to succeed St. Thomas of Canterbury. He is constantly complaining of the ill-treatment of princes and the envy of his contemporaries. He frequently extols his own eloquence and erudition, the polish of his style, and the elegance of his language, especially in the *Topography*, “ which envy itself is ashamed to carp at.”¹ He tells us elsewhere how pleasant it was to be pointed at, and to hear men say in the street, “ that is he ; ” and, amongst other good things which he declares of himself is that he was one of the handsomest men of his time !

Gerald, too, had a bad tongue, and a virulent pen. He wrote a work in three books, to which he gave the very appropriate name *De Invectionibus*, for they are exclusively devoted to the abuse of his contemporaries. The Rev. J. F. Dimock, a most painstaking editor and impartial critic, after a careful perusal of his writings, and with a full knowledge of his history, declares it as his deliberate conviction, “ that there was no invective against an opponent too virulently unjust, no imputation of the basest motives too manifestly unreasonable, and no assumption of the vilest and most horrible calumnies as certain truths too atrocious for him.” This is strong but not unmerited language. And, exactly in proportion as he unscrupulously abused his enemies, he extravagantly lauded his friends. His language, either in praise or blame, is never moderate ; he is much too fond of superlatives and universals, forgetful of the scholastic maxim, that they generally hide falsehood. He views everything through the spectacles of his prejudices ; every man with

¹ See the *Introitus ad Expugnationem*.

him is either a hero or a villain, and the line of demarcation was to be drawn between those whom he loved and those whom he hated. As Dryden said of Villiers,

“ Railing and praising were his usual themes,
And both, to show his judgment, in extremes,
So over-violent, or over-civil,
That every man with him was God or devil.”

His credulity and superstition are hardly less remarkable than his vanity. In the later editions of the *Expugnatio*, which he also calls a *Vaticinalis Historia*, because it records the fulfilment of prophecy, he inserts many predictions taken from Merlin of Celidon, whose works, Dr. Lynch tells us, were honoured with a place on the “Index.” Giraldus fell in with this Book of Prophecy in the year 1188, when accompanying Archbishop Baldwin on his journey through Wales. It was written in Welsh, and, as Giraldus himself admits, was greatly corrupted by recent interpolations of the Welsh bards. To these prophecies he evidently attached implicit faith, and he records their fulfilment in the language of Sacred Scripture. Such of them as are genuine are quite as vague as any to be found in Moore’s Almanac; those that seem to have been marvellously fulfilled bear intrinsic evidence of having been written after the events took place which they pretend to foretell.

At the end of his autobiography, Giraldus gravely narrates some thirty visions with which he was favoured by heaven. Anyone else would set them down as ordinary dreams, but in his opinion they were all of divine origin. If it were the will of heaven to make revelations in the visions of the night, Gerald Barry is probably the last person that Providence would be likely to select as the recipient of its favours. We suspect his dreams often came from his stomach, or through the ivory gate, whence

“ Falsa ad cælum mittunt insomnia manes.”

Writing with a hurried pen, and under the influence of excited feelings, he is very often inaccurate in his dates, even when recording the events of his own life, and frequently inconsistent in his statements. Hatred and partizanship hurry

him into the most opposite extremes. Under their influence, true to the motto of his family, he dashes onward with the pen, as recklessly as his brothers did with the sword, and then he stops at nothing, whether it be wild assertion, absurd argument, or unfounded calumny.

Proud, passionate, and self-willed, like the haughty race from which he sprang, yet he was kind-hearted, generous, and lavishly profuse of his ample resources. Such a man might be a brave soldier, or an eloquent speaker, but an honest and impartial historian never.

Neither was he without prejudice. Gerald's great object was to justify that invasion, which he so pompously calls a "conquest." He was intimately connected, by ties of blood, or friendship, with almost all the leaders of the early invaders. Henry II., in his representations to the Pope, represented the Irish as a barbarous, unclean, and only nominally Christian people. The Normans came over to reform the Church, and civilise the country, and his great object was to show how much the Church needed the one, and the people the other. His history, therefore, is not as the well-balanced narrative of an impartial judge, but the one-sided statement of a prejudiced and passionate advocate.

The *Topography* he himself always regarded as his masterpiece. He spent, he says, three years in its composition—an assertion which it is not easy to reconcile with his own dates. It was begun probably in 1185, and finished early in 1188. He presented a copy in that year to Archbishop Baldwin, who admired it very much, and had a portion of it read for his entertainment every day during his journey through Wales. It was dedicated to Henry II., who, however, does not appear to have sufficiently appreciated the honour, for, after his death, Giraldus complained that he gained nothing by his work but empty praise.

This treatise is divided into three "Distinctions," in scholastic fashion, which we should call Books; and each Distinction is subdivided into Chapters. The first "Distinction" treats of the physical geography and natural history of Ireland—its extent, climate, soil, productions, etc. The second "Distinction" treats of the marvels, natural and

supernatural, of Ireland; and the third treats of the inhabitants—their history, character, and morals. To write a fair work on this subject would require an accurate and extensive knowledge both of the country and the people. Giraldus had neither the one nor the other. His first visit to Ireland was paid in February, 1183, when he remained probably not more than six months; on the occasion of his second visit with Prince John he remained a year. But his knowledge of the country was confined to the district afterwards known as the Pale, and a few of the southern seaport towns. He had no knowledge whatsoever of the Irish language, then exclusively spoken by the people. The Irish chieftains, insulted and outraged by John and his insolent courtiers, who pulled their beards and ridiculed their dress and language, had all turned against the English. His means of information, therefore, were imperfect, and the time at his disposal very limited, even if it were not otherwise employed. Hence, in this “admirable” work of his, intended for the information of his countrymen and posterity, he frequently falls into the most ludicrous mistakes. His account of the river Shannon is worth quoting as a specimen.

“The Shannon rises in a very large and most beautiful lake (Lough Derg), which divides Munster from Connaught, and stretches forth its two arms to the opposite ends of the world. One flows towards the south, rolling beside the city of Killaloe, and encircling Limerick; and from that point, during a course of more than one hundred miles, it divides the two Munsters until it falls into the sea at St. Brendan. The other arm, equally large, divides Connaught from Meath, and farther Ulster, and after many and various windings falls into the sea at Ballyshannon!”

He tells us that the shores of Ireland are low and sandy, and all the mountains are in the interior of the country—a statement which every child at school knows to be the reverse of the truth. The mountains are almost all within view of the sea, and the interior from Dublin to Galway is an immense plain. He is very fond of the marvellous. He gravely informs us that shortly before the coming of the English a large fish was found near Carlingford, having three golden teeth, fifty

ounces in weight—a presage, he adds, of the golden days of the English invasion.

“There is a lake in Northern Munster having two islands. In the larger island no creature of the female sex can live ; in the smaller no person ever died, or can die, a natural death !” “Aren,” he says, “is an island on the western coast of Connaught, dedicated to St. Brendan, where the dead are left unburied, yet never corrupt. A man may there see and recognise his grandfather, great grandfather, and all his ancestors. There is a well in Munster wherein if any one bathes, his hair never becomes gray, and another in Ulster, a bath in whose wonderful waters will prevent a person ever becoming gray.”

In his own time a priest had a long interview with a man and woman in Meath, who had been changed into wolves, and who addressed him in their vulpine form. Irish cocks don't crow, like others, at three distinct intervals of the night, but only once before the dawn ; and the reason is because the nights in Ireland are short on account of its proximity to the setting sun !

And so on with, perhaps, the greater portion of this accurate *Topography*. But it is in the “Third Distinction,” when he comes to speak of the people, that Giraldus pours out all the venom of his nature. He allows that they are physically a tall and handsome race of men, but rude, barbarous, inhospitable, and treacherous. His reasons, however, are by no means convincing. Like the ancient Hellenes, or the inhabitants of the Celestial Empire, Giraldus assumes that his own people were the standard of perfection ; hence the Irish are rude, because, unlike the Norman, they wore long hair and beards ; they are barbarous, because, not living in cities, they led a rather free and roving life ; and they are treacherous, because they always carried their battle-axes in their hands, and gave the plundering Normans some ugly knocks when they least expected them.

He admits, however, that the Irish were pre-eminently skilled in music beyond any nation he ever knew ; and he tells how deftly the harper swept the brazen strings, apparently without care, yet in flowing melody and with perfect art. Then he enters into a long dissertation on music, which he

considered the finest chapter in the work, and modestly calls a *voluptuosa digressio*.

The clergy, he admits, were remarkable for chastity, abstinence, and zeal in the discharge of their duties; but, seeing that Henry had undertaken to reform them, of course he had to find fault; so he adds: "Post jugem tam jejuniorum quam orationum instantiam vino variisque potionibus diurnos labores enormius quam deceret nocte redimunt"—a statement utterly inconsistent with the truth of the praises which he had bestowed on them.

By far the most interesting portion of the *Topography* is contained in those chapters which describe the soil, climate, and natural productions of Ireland. Many of his observations are both original and accurate. He very faithfully describes the genial mildness of climate and the salubrity of the air. He justly praises the natural fertility of the soil, but remarks, that the most promising harvests often disappoint the farmer's hopes—an observation that the experience of many a year since has amply verified. He was probably the first to notice the difference in size, and in the quality of the fur, between the English and the Irish hare, a distinction made only quite recently by scientific naturalists.

In the *Expugnatio*, Gerald gives a history, in three books, of the Anglo-Norman invasion down to the year 1186. If he could be impartial, he had ample means of obtaining authentic information concerning the invasion, from the invaders themselves. Many of the leaders in that strange and stirring drama were his own near relatives. But of impartiality there was not a trace in the mental constitution of Gerald Barry. He gives elaborate, and—if they could be regarded as likenesses—valuable historical portraits of the leaders; but, in almost every instance, they are either too flattering pictures or gross caricatures. The entire work is rather a poetic romance than sober history, and, such as it is, a great part of it is merely a glorification of his own relatives, the Geraldines. Gerald was proud of his descent; and he had some ground for boasting. Nesta was, indeed, the mother, lawful or unlawful, of a mighty race. Among the leaders of the invasion, there were at least three of her sons, eight of her grandsons, and one grandson-in-law.

Her son by Stephen, Constable of Cardigan, hence named Fitz-stephen, was the leader of the very first band that landed at Bannow about the 1st of May, 1169. Her son, Maurice Fitzgerald, followed shortly after, and Raymond Le Gros, her grandson; and they had, perhaps, the largest share in the foul work of slaughter and pillage which even Gerald himself severely condemned. But they were withal a brave, generous, and high-spirited race. They built some of our proudest castles and founded many of the richest and noblest of our monasteries. In dark and evil days most of them were loyal to the ancient faith. They fought and suffered for it—exile, imprisonment, and death. The Fitzgeralds, Barrys, and Graces were co-mingled in blood, and intertwined in affection, with the old Celtic race. Ireland felt pride in their glory and sorrow in their fall.

But for Giraldus there were no heroes but the Geraldines. "Who are they who penetrate the enemy's strongholds? The Geraldines. Who are the saviours of their country? The Geraldines. Whom does black envy calumniate? The Geraldines. O men of might renowned," he says, "heedless of life in the pursuit of glory, cease not to walk in your accustomed path of valour. *Felices facti si quid mea carmina possunt.*"

We cannot expect that a man who talks in this way of his own brothers, uncles, nephews, and cousins, would be just to others. He is manifestly unfair in his character of Richard, Earl of Striguil, paints Fitz-Audeline de Burgo in the darkest colours, and by no means does justice either to Hugh de Lacy, or John de Courcy, the bravest and best of the Normans.

Dr. Lynch says, "the style of Cambrensis is dry, barren, stilted, and sometimes bombastic." In this estimate we cannot coincide. The most glaring fault of the style of Giraldus, which Dr. Lynch does not notice, is his passion for alliteration and antithesis. And there can be no doubt that, to obtain this meretricious adornment, he sacrifices both the purity of his language, and the accuracy of his statements. But, leaving out of the question this most frequent and glaring fault, then esteemed a high excellence, the style of Giraldus is a very favourable specimen of mediæval Latinity.

Of course, we cannot expect in such a writer either the elegance or purity of the classical authors ; but his language is clear, vigorous, and concise ; his sentences compact and well constructed. No doubt, he frequently turns off into the most irrelevant digressions, interlards his history with curious moral reflections, and puts absurdly pompous harangues into the mouths of men who did not know how to write their names, or read them when written. But this is a fault of the matter rather than of the form.

The deliberate conclusion of his English editor is, that " the Irish treatises of Giraldus are in many ways interesting and valuable, but it is of their historical value I have to speak, and that they give a fair, impartial account, either of the Irish people, or the English invaders, or of the doings of either, I confidently and emphatically deny." But Gerald himself was so proud of his work that he caused the *Topography* to be publicly recited at Oxford for three days, a " Distinction " each day ; and, no doubt, he had a large and appreciative audience to whom he related all the wonderful things about the wild Irish, for during the three days of the recitation he feasted all Oxford in the most sumptuous style. On the first day he entertained the poor of the town, the second was for the dons and graduates, and on the third he feasted the soldiers and citizens. It was a novel and rather expensive way of publishing his works.

Yet, highly spiced as these Irish treatises were for the palates of his countrymen, they do not appear to have been well received by his contemporaries. He bitterly complains, more than once, that they were carped at, and lacerated by the envious, but he expresses his perfect confidence that posterity would receive them with applause. And his anticipations have in a certain sense, been realised. His books were not, indeed, either generally known, or frequently quoted, by the earlier English historians. But the minions of Elizabeth resolved to employ, not only the sword in the reduction, but the pen in the defamation, of Ireland. So Giraldus was drawn from the dust of the libraries, and an English translation of the *Expugnatio* was published in the 1587 edition of the *Chronicles of Holinshed* by " John Hooker, of the city of

Exeter, gentleman." It was, however, in Camden's *Anglica, Hibernica, Cambrica, a Veteribus Scripta*, published at Frankford, in 1602 that the *Topography* and the *Conquest* were first made known to the literary world. His object was, by publishing the calumnies of Giraldus, to justify before Europe the hideous atrocities committed in Ireland during the reign of Elizabeth. And in this purpose Camden succeeded only too well. Dr. John Lynch informs us "that the wild dreams of Cambrensis were taken up by a herd of scribblers and embellished by many new stories of a similar stamp. Thus the name of Irishman became a byword of reproach in the mouths of mountebanks, in taverns, in club-meetings, in private society. His calumnies were reprinted in the language of every nation; no new geography, no history of the world, no work on the manners or customs of different nations, appeared in which these calumnies were not reproduced until my heart sickened at the sight."

But Ireland had sons who, if they could not wield the sword, were well able to wield the pen in her defence. And it is not a little remarkable that the literary champions, who girt on their armour to do battle for the fair fame of Ireland, were both of Anglo-Norman descent. Father Stephen White, a learned Jesuit, and literary correspondent of Usher, was the first to enter the lists. His *Apology* appeared on the Continent shortly after the publication of Camden's volume. It was, for a long time, regarded as lost, but has recently been reprinted from a copy accidentally discovered in the Burgundian Library at Brussels.

But the great champion, by whom Cambrensis was utterly overthrown, was Dr. John Lynch, who published, in 1662, his fine work entitled *Cambrensis Eversus*, under the *nom de plume* of Gratianus Lucius. Dr. Lynch was a native of the ancient and loyal "Citie of the Tribes," where he was born about the year 1600. He traced his origin to Hugh de Lacy, and was not a little proud of his ancestral loyalty and Anglo-Norman blood. In an introductory chapter, full of rather fulsome flattery of the ungrateful Stuart, he dedicates his great work to Charles II. Dr. Lynch was eminently fitted for the task which he undertook. After graduating with great

distinction in philosophy and theology in France, he returned to his native city, where he combined for many years the double function of priest and schoolmaster. He thus acquired that familiarity with the classics which is manifest in his eloquent and flowing style. He has also a wonderful power of illustration, indicating at once the wealth of his intellect and the fertility of his imagination. But he was more than a learned theologian and elegant scholar ; he was profoundly versed, perhaps more so than any man of his time, except Roger Flaherty, in the language, history, and antiquities of Ireland. Hence he has produced a work, too learned to be popular, but a mine of knowledge on almost every subject connected with Irish history.

That this noble work has not gone entirely out of print, we owe to the unselfish labour of the late Rev. Matthew Kelly of Maynooth, who edited it with a translation, and enriched it with many valuable notes ; and it will go down to posterity an enduring memorial of the learning, the devotion, and the lofty patriotism of those two noble-hearted Irish priests.

We have done with Gerald Barry. Of late years a kind of reaction has set in in his favour. He is quoted, with something like approval, even by such men as Mr. Prendergast, whose solid learning, and whole-souled devotion to Ireland, nobody can call in question. Under these circumstances, lest any incautious reader might place too much reliance on the statements of Gerald Barry, it cannot be out of place to endeavour to show what manner of man he was.

DEDICATION SERMON.¹

"Hæc est victoria quæ vincit mundum, fides nostra."

"This is the victory which overcometh the world, our faith."

(1 John v. 4.)

MOST REVEREND LORDS, VERY REV. AND DEARLY BELOVED
BRETHREN,

THE great Doctor of the Gentiles, writing to his countrymen, the Hebrews, points out in the tenth chapter of his Epistle that the spiritual life of every just man is derived from faith, and that it is nourished and maintained by faith—*justus ex fide vivit*. In the next chapter he shows that the same is true of the entire Hebrew Church and people throughout all its glorious history—its persecutions, its battles, and its victories—it lived by faith and conquered by faith. Of course, I take the word in its usual Pauline meaning, as operative or practical faith working by charity. The same Apostle elsewhere ² frequently speaks of the Christian's life as a perpetual struggle between two opposing forces, which are called in Scripture the "world" and "the kingdom of God," and this unceasing struggle both of the individual soul and of the entire Church he calls the battle of the faith—"*certamen fidei*," ³ Moreover, as the life and strength both of the Christian soldier and of the whole Christian Church springs from faith, so also the final victory is gained by faith. This is what is asserted in the words of my text, "*Hæc est victoria quæ vincit mundum, fides nostra*." By faith we live, by faith we fight, by faith we conquer.

Now, dearly beloved, there are, doubtless, many aspects in which this most beautiful ceremony of to-day will present itself to religious-minded men. To me, however, it appears to be before all things a great national act of faith made by this most representative assembly in the name of the Irish Church and of the Irish people. It is, moreover, a trophy—and a

¹ Preached on the occasion of the dedication of the New Church of Maynooth College, 24th June 1891.

² *Eph.* vi. 12; *1 Cor.* x. 25.

³ *1 Tim.* vi. 12.

fitting and glorious trophy—of the victory of our faith in the past ; and it is also the symbol and artistic expression of our undying faith in the supernatural destiny of the Irish race in the future. Such are the thoughts that, with your permission, I propose to develop to-day before this illustrious assembly.

The dedication of a temple for the worship of the living God is, at all times, and in any place, a public and solemn act of faith in God. It is a recognition of that infinite goodness and supreme dominion over all His creatures, in virtue of which He is entitled to public worship—that is, to their homage, obedience, and love. It is also a confession that from Him, and Him alone, comes every good and perfect gift ; that in His fatherly providence, He always watches over His children with tender solicitude ; that He is ever ready to hear their petitions and forgive their offences, and also to pour out with bountiful hand the infinite riches of His mercy and love. Wherefore, in recognition of all that He has given us, we build Him a house to be peculiarly His own ; then we consecrate it with many a solemn prayer and mystic rite, because He is a holy and jealous God,¹ and everything offered to Him, or employed in His service, should be purified from the defiling contact of whatever is profane or impure. Hence the theologians² tell us—and, better than all others, St. Thomas, with his own beautiful simplicity—that everything appertaining to the worship of God should be made holy with a holiness appropriate to its own nature ; and that this holiness itself comes from God, through the ministry of His Church. The holiness thus conferred by the blessing of the Church's ministers is of a twofold character—negative and positive. The former consists in the purification of the thing so consecrated from all unholiness acquired by any contact with diabolical influences, or by its employment for any profane or sinful purpose. But the latter is of a higher nature still. The consecrated thing thereby assumes a supernatural character ; it is elevated from natural to divine uses ; it passes, moreover, from the dominion of man to that of God ; it is placed in an especial manner under the guardianship of

¹ *Deut.* vi. 15.

² *Quaest.* lxxxiii., *Art.* 3, *Pars Tertia.*

angels ; so that it becomes, verily and indeed, a holy thing, sacred to God, which cannot be profaned without the guilt of sacrilege. Hence it is that the priest himself is ordained, that his vestments are blessed, that the altar and its vessels are consecrated, and that the temple for prayer and sacrifice is solemnly dedicated to the worship of God.

But in the case of the Church itself, this consecration is, as you have seen, a specially significant and laborious rite. Its walls are sprinkled by the Bishop with lustral water, within and without, above, below, and in the middle. The cross was set up in twelve different places around the walls, and these crosses were themselves anointed with the holy oil ; its very doors and threshold are sanctified ; when they were thrown open the Bishop took possession of the building in the name of the Most High God ; on its floors, sprinkled with ashes, were written diagonally the letters of the Greek and Latin alphabet—from *a* to *ω*—to signify not only that the Church is the school, where the elements of Christian doctrine are taught, but also to show that Christ is the *principium et finis*—the beginning and the end of all things—the fountain of all knowledge and of all holiness. So from floor to roof this house has been sanctified to the Lord ; every stone in its walls has been made holy ; it has become, in the language of Scripture, an “ awful place ”—*terribilis est locus iste*. It no longer belongs to man, but to God ; it is the throne of His mercy and of His majesty—verily and indeed the House of God and Gate of Heaven. *Haec domus Dei est et porta caeli*.¹ “ I have sanctified this house to Myself,” said the Lord of old, “ to put My name there for ever ; and My eyes and My heart shall be there always.”² Hence, St. Thomas declares³ that the Church, by its consecration, has acquired a certain *virtus spiritualis*, or supernatural efficacy, which renders it apt to excite devotion and reverence in the minds of the worshippers, and, moreover, disposes God more readily to hear their prayers—thus bringing man nearer to God, and uniting, as it were, earth and heaven. And, no doubt, it is this same blessed vision of spiritual peace and beauty, this union of earth and heaven,

¹ *Gen.* xxviii. 17.

² *3 Kings* ix. 3.

³ *Quaest.* lxxxiv., *Art.* 3, *ut supra*.

that inspires the Church to-day, when she sings in strains of divinest song :—

Cælestis urbs Jerusalem,
Beata pacis visio,
Quæ celsis de viventibus
Saxis ad astra tolleris,
Sponsæque ritu cingeris
Mille angelorum millibus.

But the special circumstances surrounding the ceremony of to-day make it a historic dedication, and a national act of faith. This is not the consecration of a mere parochial church, or even of a diocesan cathedral : it is the consecration of a national temple. For, as this College of Maynooth belongs to every diocese in Ireland, so this church, which is its necessary complement and perfection, belongs also to all Ireland. And, therefore, it is fitting that the gathering here to-day should be, as indeed it is, a national, representative assembly—representative of all orders and of all grades in our ancient national Church, the very sight of which must awaken many stirring memories of an eventful and not inglorious past.

Yours, my Lords, is not a Church of yesterday. You are the spiritual heirs by an unbroken lineage of an illustrious and long-descended line. The mitres that you wear were worn by the saints of Ireland well-nigh thirteen hundred years ago, before any of our modern European kingdoms had yet begun to exist. And these mitres of yours are studded, as with diamonds, by the names and deeds of your holy and learned predecessors. That ancient Church, too, which you rule and represent, has never been sullied by the guilt of heresy ; throughout its long history it never failed in its allegiance to the See of Peter. Its prelates were never guilty of any act of national apostacy, either through fear of tyrants or greed of gold. Although they were sifted like wheat, they were always found constant in the hour of trial. True, indeed, their ancient cathedrals were alienated or destroyed ; their altars were overthrown ; their schools were closed ; their possessions were confiscated ; they themselves were persecuted, banished, or put to death. But, through good and ill, they clung with unwavering fidelity to the faith of Patrick and to the chair of Peter. And, surely, the mind that looks back

upon the past must rejoice to see you all assembled here to-day, strong in faith and courage and freedom, to dedicate this national church to the glory of God, under the invocation of our national apostle.

What Catholic who has a knowledge of the dark history of the past would not feel a thrill of pride to witness that grand procession sweeping through those noble cloisters into this beautiful church, to unite in offering to God this solemn Mass of Thanksgiving? There walked the heirs of Patrick, of Laurence, of Ailbe, and of Jarlath, wearing the Pallium of Rome, and thereby proclaiming to all men that it was from the See of Peter they, like their predecessors, derived the archiepiscopal dignity and the plenitude of the apostolic power. There walked their brother prelates from all the provinces of Ireland, the rulers of those old historic sees, whose saints and scholars carried the light of the Gospel all over Western Europe, long before the Dane or Norman swooped down upon our shores. There, too, were bishops of Irish birth or blood, the rulers of churches in worlds beyond the seas, which were unknown to our fathers, and whose presence here to-day is at once a proof of their affectionate devotion to this College and to their native land, and a symbol also of the unity and Catholicity of the Church of God. There were to be seen representatives of the clergy from all parts of Ireland, who have come here to show their love for this venerable Alma Mater of the Irish priesthood, the nursing mother of so many learned and illustrious men, both at home and abroad. There, too, were to be seen the heads of all the religious families of the Irish Church. The black hoods of that great Order which has given us the Angel of the Schools to hold the first place in our halls, and the Rosary to hold the first place in our hearts, were there. There the brown habit of St. Francis was fitly seen, for it was never absent in the day of grief and trial in the past, when our churches were the mountain caves, and it was worn by men like Duns Scotus and Luke Wadding, whose names will never be forgotten in the schools of Ireland. There, too, were the sons of Ignatius, who have taken the front place in every branch of Christian learning for the last three hundred years.

and who served our Irish Church with unflinching fidelity in the time of her greatest need. But, how can I name them all? Cistercians and Carmelites and Augustinians, Passionists and Redemptorists, the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, the Oblates of Mary, and the Sons of St. Vincent de Paul—they were all present to lend dignity and significance to this most beautiful and impressive scene.

Therefore, I say that the dedication of this church, with all its attendant circumstances, is a great historic dedication, similar to those recorded in the general history of the Church, and more especially in our own annals. Such events, like the Pasch of old, are too momentous to be easily forgotten. God Himself forbids it. “*Habebitis hunc diem in monumentum et celebrabitis eum solemnem Domino in generationibus vestris cultu sempiterno.*”¹ This day will be a monument for future ages, and fitly so, for it is significant of the deep faith and generous piety of our people, as well as of the vivid spiritual life and learning of the priesthood in our own times. The age that has produced such a church and such a college will go down to latest posterity amongst the memorable eras of Irish history, even as the ruins of Cashel and Clonmacnoise tell of the ancient glories of our Church, and are amongst the most significant features in her history.

I notice three such memorable dedications briefly recorded in our annals; and each is the picture of spiritual life of its own time. We are told in the Tripartite Life of St. Patrick that he built his first church within a rath “at Armagh, which he blessed and consecrated,” and “the way St. Patrick measured the rath was this—the angel before him and Patrick behind the angel; with his household, and with Ireland’s elders (the bishops), and the staff of Jesus in his hands; and he said that great would be the crime of him who should sin therein, even as great would be the reward of him who should do God’s will therein.” The church was probably built in a few days; the “great house” was seven and twenty feet; the “kitchen,” or residence for the clergy, was seventeen feet; and the sacristy or chancel—it is uncertain which—was seven feet (long). It was built on the same grand height

¹ *Exod.* xii. 14.

on which the new Catholic cathedral now stands, but what a contrast between this church that we have dedicated to St. Patrick to-day and that first church which he himself built at Armagh ! That primitive oratory was probably built of wood, or of dry stones ; its floor was clay ; its windows were two or three small narrow openings not more than six inches wide ; its altar a rough flag or plain board. What a contrast to the majestic proportions of this noble building, with its marble altars, and storied windows, and deftly-carven stalls, and mosaic pavements, and its glorious many-coloured roof, from which the heavenly spirits seem to look down with joy on the full splendour of the Church's most imposing ceremonial ! Patrick laid the foundations of his church in simplicity and lowliness for a rude people, still mere children in the faith, yet he laid them well upon the Rock of Peter, and he built up the edifice of living stones. So in after ages, " the rains fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, but it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock." And be assured, dearly beloved, that if this temple, which we have built and dedicated to the Lord to-day, is to live in the moral sense through the storms of the coming years, it also must be founded on the same Rock, and be built in like manner of living stones ; and then all the fury of the elements will rage against it in vain.

The next historic dedication in our Irish annals shows a very great change, and exhibits the marvellous progress made by our native Celtic Church, at least in architecture and the kindred arts, even during the subsequent centuries of confusion and disaster. It was that of a church built about six hundred and fifty years later, designed by native genius, and wrought by native workmen at the expense of one of our native princes. Its ruins are still to be seen, and tell to every passer-by more eloquently than I can, what Celtic architecture might have become in Ireland under a strong Government and a united people. That beautiful church, built for the bishop-king, Cormac M'Carthy, was dedicated, as we are told in the Annals of Innisfallen, in the year 1137, " by the archbishop and bishops of Munster, and by all the great men of Ireland, both lay and ecclesiastical." This brief record indicates the

presence of a great representative assembly at the dedication of the Royal church that crowned the Royal fortress. It was felt to be a great occasion, as, indeed, it was ; for in that chaste and beautiful building, we have, as the best authorities admit, the very highest expression of that Celtic art which was gradually developed from the small and rude quadrangular churches of St. Patrick's time to the exquisite architectural grace of that peerless chapel on the Royal Rock. Then came the conquering stranger " to divide and dishonour " ; and although beautiful churches were afterwards built, especially by the Cistercians and later religious orders, they can no longer be regarded as the product of purely native genius and native art. Further development was arrested, and the purely Celtic type was seen no more.

How munificent were the native chiefs and princes in their gifts for the building and decoration of churches was well shown at another historic dedication which took place a few years later, when the monastic church of Mellifont was consecrated. The primate and the papal legate were there, with seventeen other prelates, and " the number of persons of every other degree was countless." ¹ It marked a new and splendid era in the history of the Irish Church—the epoch of St. Malachy's great reform, a period as brilliant as it was brief. On that occasion, O'Loughlin, Prince of Meath, gave sixty ounces of gold, with seven score cows, and a townland near Drogheda " to God and to the clergy, as an offering for his soul." His daughter, Dervorgilla, gave sixty ounces of gold also ; O'Carroll, prince of Oriel, made a similar offering ; and, doubtless, the other chiefs and ladies followed their example. Sixty ounces of gold in those days was a very large sum, at least twelve times the value of what it would be at present, and such offerings show that our native princes, although much given to strife and bloodshed, were men of faith, whose munificence for religious purposes may be equalled, but can hardly be surpassed. Well, this church will be a similar land-mark in our ecclesiastical history for all time. It can never be denied that the men who built this College and this Collegiate Church were men who loved learning and religion.

¹ *Four Masters*, A.D. 1157.

I have also said that this church is a trophy of the victory of our faith in the past. Yes, we have fought and we have conquered after a protracted and desperate struggle, and here is the memorial and the proof of victory. To many persons the history of Ireland is nothing but the melancholy record of national confusion and disaster, but it is not so to the eye of faith. To me, at least, it appears that there is a divine purpose palpably running through all the history of Christian Ireland. It is written in every page of our annals. They are the records of a nation that seems to me to have been chosen, as visibly as were the Hebrews of old, for a divine mission ; and that mission appears to be the preservation and propagation of Catholic truth. Our work is to teach, to preach, and, if need be, to suffer. It was once the work of a divine life on earth, and is still the divinest mission of a nation or of a national church. We are a poor people with very limited resources. Our glory in the past was not the glory of conquest, or of commerce, or of imperial colonization. We cannot pretend to be in the least like Greece, Rome, or England. Our glory has been in the past the glory of religion and of letters—that is, of religious learning ; and of the arts that are akin to, and spring from, this religious spirit. And if we are to have national glory in the future, it must be of the same character ; I can see no reasonable hope of anything else.

Worldly-minded men think our history is an inglorious record, because, to a great extent, it is a history of strife and suffering ; but from a spiritual point of view it is a glorious and successful struggle for the faith ; and what to the one will be its darkest scenes, will appear to the other to be its brightest pages.

At first this conflict was waged by St. Patrick himself against druidism and paganism. It was a longer and a more stubborn, as well as a more perilous battle, than is commonly supposed. But he and his disciples won a complete victory. This was followed by that extraordinary efflorescence of young Christianity in Ireland, to which the history of no other country furnishes a parallel. The history of that period is especially noteworthy, because the Irish Church has never

since that time been really free to shape her own destinies and follow the bent of her own genius. It is there we must look for the true index of her character, as well as for the keynote of her history. And what do we find? At home such a development of religious culture and of the religious life as made Ireland for three centuries the home of saints and scholars and the seminary of North-western Europe. And abroad we find these Irish monks swarming like bees and preaching the Gospel everywhere. Their baggage was light, indeed. A single habit, with a staff in his hand and a wallet on his back, containing a few books, formed all a monk's impedimenta. With these the Irish monk was ready for the road. *Peregrinari pro Christo* was his motto; it did not in the least matter to him where he was to go, or how he was to live—God would take care of him. He was restrained by no ties, deterred by no dangers, stopped by no obstacles. He felt himself called, like Abraham, to leave his country and kindred and his father's house, and come to the land which the Lord his God would show him. So went these Irish monks to preach the Gospel, and they went in crowds. One writer says it became a second nature to them;¹ another says they inundated the Continent of Europe like the waves of the sea. They dared and suffered everything and were found everywhere—in the glens of the Scottish Highlands and in the fens of Saxon-land, in the marshes of Flanders and in the forests of Burgundy, amid the snows of the Alps and in the valleys of the Apennines, on desert islands and in populous cities. The strong voice of those strange earnest men was heard everywhere proclaiming a divine message, of which their lives was a living example, and therefore their message was listened to, even where others had failed. They were successful beyond their own most ardent expectations; they founded churches and monasteries and schools, which for many ages became centres of civilization and nurseries of sacred science—and in some cases have continued to be such even down to our own time. The names of Bobbio, Luxeuil, and St. Gall, are known to every scholar in Europe, and it is now well known also that they were Irish

¹ "Natio Scotorum quibus consuetudo peregrinandi jam pene in naturam conversa est." Wal. Strabo, *Vita S. Galli*, c. xlvi.

monasteries founded and peopled, at least in the beginning, by Irish monks, who have left their marks behind them in every great library in Europe. Yes, wherever Irish monks went to preach the Gospel, they also carried the torch of sacred science, which they had brought with them from their own monasteries at home. Iona was the Maynooth of Scotland for about five hundred years. Lindisfarne, during the seventh century, was a centre of light and culture for all England from the Thames to the Tweed ; and during that century, at least, it was practically either through its founders or their pupils, an Irish missionary college. It was an Irish monk who founded on the marshy shores of the river Cam, first a hermitage, and afterwards a monastery, which ultimately grew into the University of Cambridge. That St. Gall, whose name is known to all Europe, was so humble, that he refused the bishopric of Constance in favour of his own deacon, John, who was promoted to it on his recommendation ; yet so learned, that he preached the consecration sermon in Latin, before all the clergy and princes of the district. It is still extant, and clearly proves that in one respect, at least, the nineteenth century is not much before the sixth.

Virgilius, Bishop of Salzburg, was the first astronomer, and one of the first theologians of his own age, as the great St. Boniface must have reluctantly admitted. Scotus Erigena was the best Greek scholar of his own time, and the only one then in France, who was qualified to translate from the original Greek into Latin, the well-known works attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite. There was no man in Gaul or Italy who pulverized the Iconoclasts of the Western Church so completely as our own Irish Dungal. I might extend the list, but it is unnecessary, for it is now admitted by all that our Irish scholars were the first of the time both at home and abroad from the seventh to the tenth century. The great libraries of the continent now contain the literary treasures filched from those ancient Irish monasteries ; but their origin cannot be questioned, for they were copied and annotated with loving care by Irish hands and in Irish characters, more than eight hundred years ago.

And those noble-minded men fought the battle of the

faith, not only by preaching and teaching, but also by shedding their blood. Last summer I saw the beautiful cathedral of Würzburg in Franconia—a thoroughly Catholic country—and I was told on the ground, what I knew well before, that it was built on the very spot where St. Killian and his two companions—Irishmen all—suffered martyrdom. You have all heard of Livinus and Dymrna, and Rumold and Trudbert, as well as many others of both sexes, who gave the blood of Ireland for the faith, not at home, but abroad, where they lived and preached and suffered. *Nec rosae nec lilia desunt*—but the lilies grew mostly at home, and the roses abroad, during this the brightest period of the ecclesiastical history of Ireland. It was, however, all the same, one battle for the faith.

And, surely, no one will deny that the Danish wars were also one long conflict for the faith. Brian Boru was as much a battler for the faith as he was for his country. He was the Judas Maccabeus of Ireland, for it is not too much to say that he lived and died in arms for his country and his country's God. There is nothing in Irish history to compare with his noble death—that old man, in the eighty-eighth year of his age, girding on his armour for the battle of the faith, and, when he was unable to wield the sword, retiring to his tent with the crucifix in his hand to pray for his country; then struck down by the fugitive foe, who thought him a priest, with his gallant son, too, who fell on the same fatal, but glorious field, and his nephew, and his grandson, a boy of fifteen, who was found drowned at the weir of Clontarf with his two hands twisted in the hair of a Dane, whom he had pursued into the tide. And the gallant old warrior not only gave his life for Ireland, but he had previously, by will, given his body to Armagh, and rich gifts of gold and silver and raiment to the most celebrated of our churches and of our schools. He was a man of faith—he lived and conquered and died in faith—and, therefore, he will live for ever, the greatest of our national heroes, in the affectionate memory of his countrymen.

So likewise the great reformers of the twelfth century—Malachy, Celsus, Gelasius, and Laurence O'Toole, were all

champions of the faith, fighting the battles of God—no longer, indeed, against the Danes, but against degenerate Irishmen, who followed too closely the bad example of the Danes. They fought and they conquered, too; but they did not enjoy long the fruits of victory, for another spiritual foe was at hand. Yes; to me, at least, it has always appeared that the long struggle between the Celt and the Anglo-Norman was in reality another battle for the faith—and why? Because the Anglo-Norman Church, both in England and Scotland, was enslaved by the Crown; and, although St. Thomas gave his blood for the freedom of the Church, that freedom was again destroyed during the later reigns of the Henrys and Edwards. Well, if the Anglo-Norman domination, and with it the Anglo-Norman Church, had extended beyond the bounds of the Pale over all Celtic Ireland, would not our Irish Church have been enslaved; and, is there not every reason to fear that, when the hour of trial came, the same apostacy might have taken place in Ireland as took place in England and Scotland?

No one will deny that for the last three hundred years—those I mean preceding Emancipation—the very life of our Catholic people was a struggle for the faith. I will not now attempt to describe all that our forefathers suffered during that protracted and glorious strife. If we had few martyrs in the early Church of Ireland at home, there was no lack of them now—martyrs known to God alone—the victims of Elizabeth's cruel deputies, and Cromwell's massacres; the slaves that were transported to Barbadoes and the other West Indian Islands; the priests that were slain at the altar; the peasants that were starved to death, or hunted down like wolves; the judicial murders by packed jury and by court-martial. All these men fell in the battle of the faith quite as much as O'Hurley, O'Healy, or Oliver Plunkett. What St. Paul says of the Jewish heroes of old is literally true of them also: "They were stoned, they were cut asunder, they were tormented, they were put to death by the sword, they wandered about in sheep-skins, in goat-skins, being in want, distressed, and afflicted—men of whom the world was not worthy."¹ Their blood, dearly beloved, was the price of our

¹ *Heb.* xi. 37.

victory. And when we come to dedicate to-day this proud monument of resurgent Catholicity in Ireland, it is right that we should commemorate those martyrs of our faith ; yea, and tell our children unto latest generations how patiently they suffered and how nobly they died. When the Roman generals of old returned home after some specially glorious campaign. they were wont to build triumphal arches to be trophies and monuments of their victories for posterity. It is fitting that we, too, should erect our trophies—not vain monuments to minister to human pride, but churches and colleges like this and others on smaller scale throughout the country, which will serve to tell future generations that the Catholics of emancipated Ireland used their religious freedom and their slender resources, like their forefathers of old, for the best of all purposes, to give glory to God and to promote the diffusion of learning and the practice of virtue amongst their countrymen.

Neither is the history of this battle of the faith without its own lessons for the future. I am speaking before masters in Israel, and I wish to speak in all reverence and diffidence, and to address myself chiefly to the students of the College. But God Himself took occasion of the dedication of Solomon's Temple to address a very solemn warning to the king and his people : " If you and your children," He said. " revolting, shall turn away from following Me, and will not keep My commandments and My ceremonies, which I have set before them, but will go and worship strange gods and adore them, I will take away Israel from the face of the land which I have given them, and this temple, which I have sanctified to My name, I will cast out of My sight ; and Israel shall become a proverb and a by-word among all people." ¹ You know this threat was carried out to the letter, and a very similar threat is addressed to us by St. Paul in his *Epistle to the Romans* : " Well, because of their unbelief, they (the Jews) were broken off ; but thou standest by faith ; be not high-minded, but fear." ² That is the first lesson we have to learn to-day. Be not high-minded, but fear. Do not be too much elated on account of your victory ; don't grow wanton in your newly-obtained freedom ; as it is said in Scripture, " the beloved grew

¹ 3 *Kings* ix. 6.

² *Rom.* xi. 20.

fat and kicked ; he grew fat, and thick, and gross ; he forsook the God who made him, and departed from God his Saviour.”¹ Secondly, recollect the words, *tu fide stas*. We have no more natural right either to justification or perseverance than others who have fallen away. That is to say, we have none at all. There is no cross now above St. Sophia’s golden dome. The very ruins of the churches that echoed to the voice of Cyprian and Augustine have disappeared. There is neither an altar nor a sacrifice now in the glorious ministers of England, the work of Catholic genius and piety—*propter incredulitatem sunt fracti*—incredulity and disobedience. *Tu fide stas*. Beware, therefore lest you imitate their example in evil. Well, what, then, are you to do ? To recognise your divine mission, and to walk in the footsteps of the men of old, the men of faith ; to preach, to teach, and, if necessary, to suffer for the faith. And for this purpose this College will be in the future, as it has been in the past, the great heart of Catholic Ireland—the centre and source of its spiritual and intellectual activity.

Do not forget, either, that we are a missionary people, and that priests and bishops of Irish birth, or of Irish blood, are scattered over the whole English-speaking world. If God should call upon you, therefore, or your people, to other lands hereafter, go in the name of God to do His work, but go in the spirit of the saints of old—*peregrinari pro Christo*—and, surely, it is a noble destiny. Everyone must regret the depletion or draining off of our Irish Catholic population ; but no men of faith will regret if our surplus population should have to emigrate to foreign lands to plant there the faith and the virtues of Catholic Ireland. It follows from this also that we should not hanker too much after the ambitions of wordly-minded men, like the Israelites of old, who hungered for the flesh-pots of Egypt whilst they were on the road to the Land of Promise, and were fed by God’s bounty with manna from heaven. Neither let us follow false fires that will lead us away from the right road, but let us take as our guides in all things men strong in faith, men like the men of old, through whom, and through whom alone, salvation can ever be wrought in Israel.

¹ *Deut.* xxxii. 15.

Therefore, I say that this temple, in its enduring strength and beauty, should be for you, students of this College, a memorial of your lofty destiny and of the heavenly aspirations that should fill and expand your minds. The pictured saints that look down upon you from these walls call upon you with mute but eloquent voice to follow their example, and fight well the battle of the faith. If any of you should cling too fondly to home and country when God calls you elsewhere, look yonder at Columba leaving his beloved Derry for that lonely islet in the Scottish main—out of sight of Ireland. Yet there he built a monastery on that uncongenial soil, which was for five hundred years a nursery of religion and learning—the light of all the North. If you shrink from labour, either as students or as priests, turn your eyes to Columbanus, that invincible soldier of Christ, who crossed the Alps on foot when he was almost eighty years of age, and founded his monastery of Bobbio, on the slopes of the Apennines; ay, and helped to carry down on his own shoulders from the mountain woods the timber necessary to build it. If you would realize the love a bishop or priest should have for his flock, look yonder at St. Laurence O'Toole, trying at the peril of his life to scare away the wolves of Strongbow from the massacre of his flock. Oh, it is well planned, my young friends; you will live with the saints of Ireland; and you will be animated by their spirit. You will need it, too, for very soon you will be called to the van of the armies of the Lord. And, therefore, it is to you I chiefly address myself. Now is the time, and this is the place, to prepare yourselves for the struggle. Do not imagine for one moment that the battle is over, although the conditions of it are changed. The head and heart of a priest should be trained like the hand and eye of the soldier. His mind should be filled with all knowledge—that is all useful and appropriate knowledge—and his soul should be strengthened in all virtue. But you will not get it all in the study-halls and in the class-halls. Oh! no; here before these altars is the true *sedes sapientiæ*, where you, like the greatest teachers of the Church, can acquire a diviner wisdom than can be gathered from your books. *Erunt omnes docti a Deo.* You must be taught of God himself. From Him,

and from Him alone, comes every good and perfect gift. There is no true light that does not emanate from His throne. Let that light, the light of a lively, practical faith, illumine your minds ; let the fire of charity warm your hearts. As in the physical so in the supernatural order, both are necessary—there can be no life, no growth in holiness, no work that will endure, without them. Yes, you will receive light and help from on high, and there is only one way to get it, as you know—by prayer. Pray to God earnestly for light, and he will never leave you in doubt or in darkness. “ *Legem pone, mihi Domine, viam justificationum tuarum,*” “ *Faciem tuam illumina super servum tuum, et doce me justificationes tuas.*” ¹ Let adherence to His law, at all cost, be your principle, and the light of His face will shine upon your way. Utter that prayer in earnest, and you will never utter it in vain.

But the light of itself is not enough—you must also strengthen your souls in faith and courage. Many men know well what is right, but dare not do it, because there is no strength in their faith in God. Whereas this strong spirit of faith is the motive power that has always supplied to the saints of God the energy and momentum necessary to accomplish His work. If you thoroughly realize this thought, that you have a great and holy work to do, that you are sent by God to do it, and that He is ever ready to help you in its accomplishment, you will do wonders, because God will be with you. When Jeremias was afraid, the Lord said to him—“ Say not that I am a child, for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee ; and whatsoever I shall command thee thou shalt speak. Be not afraid of their presence, for I am with thee to deliver thee.” ²

Do you think that the arm of God is shortened, or that you, under the law of love, cannot do by your faith what the men of old did under the law of servitude ? St. Paul, at least, did not think so. In that wonderful eleventh chapter of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* he sketches the history of their national struggle for the faith, and he shows how all the great things accomplished by the heroes and heroines of the old law were all done in the might of this spirit of faith ; but God, he adds, has provided even better things for us in the New Law. And,

¹ *Psl.* cxviii. 33 ; 135.

² *Jer.* i. 7, 8.

therefore, in the next chapter, like the voice of a trumpet ringing out for battle, he calls upon us to fling away every weight and sin which surrounds us, and run forward, like soldiers when they charge, to the fight that is before us. But the battle can only be won by the courage of patient endurance; and therefore he says—*per patientiam curramus ad propositum nobis certamen*—keeping your eyes on Him who, despising shame, endured the cross, and now sits on the right hand of God on high. “Wherefore,” he adds, “lift up the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees, and make straight steps with your feet”—*propter quod remissas manus et soluta genua erigite, et gressus rectos facite pedibus vestris*.¹ Ay, gird yourselves up like men for this conflict. Stretch your limbs, and make straight steps with your feet; walking, as I have said straightforward in the path of justice—that path which is luminous with a celestial radiance—the light of the law of the Lord.

In the same chapter the Apostle reminds the Hebrews of that cloud of witnesses—witnesses to the efficacy of faith—whose noble deeds were amongst the treasured memories of their countrymen. Well, dearly beloved, we also have our own cloud of witnesses, men of our own race and nation; ay, and many of them students of this College, whose lives all teach us the same lesson. You are living, as it were, in the very midst of them. Read how these men fought the battle of the faith in Ireland from the very beginning down to our own days; and you will find that they dared, and suffered, and accomplished things almost as marvellous as any recorded of the Hebrews of old. Read, for instance—to take only one single example—read, or rather study, the “Confession” of St. Patrick, under God the author and finisher of our faith, the Moses of Ireland, and there you will find a man who perfectly realized the ideal set forth by St. Paul, who flung far from him every weight and sin that might impede him, who kept his eyes fixed on the cross, despising shame, and glorying in his sufferings for the Gospel, who made straight steps with his feet in the path of justice all the days of his life—a man who in doing the work of God, feared neither king, nor chief, nor people—a man whose heart was strong in all

¹ Heb. xii. 12.

virtues—humility, patience, courage, self-sacrifice, and disinterestedness in preaching the Gospel—a man in all things the first and greatest of that cloud of witnesses, who were animated by his spirit and inspired by his example. There is not a diocese in Ireland that has not its own saints, whose holy lives are written for your example, and whose work you will be called upon to continue. Study well the lives of those holy men ; visit the sanctuaries hallowed by their labours and their prayers ; cherish their memory in your hearts. Depend upon it, if you do, you will become wiser and better men. They had not such noble halls as you have, and their churches were very different from this chastely beautiful temple. But these noble buildings of ours would be only a mere husk or shell, if the spirit of true religion were not within them. Make sure, therefore, that in your halls there will be the same pure and holy love of learning as was in theirs, the same profound study of God's word ; and, what is even more important still, the same holy obedience, the same purity of heart, the same brotherly love, the same fervour in prayer, the same frugality, patience, and self-denial, which light up with a radiance that will shine for ever the glorious names of Clonard, Lismore, and Clonmacnoise.

I congratulate you, my Lords, to-day on the completion of this great work which you have undertaken for God and for this College. I congratulate the present and past presidents of the College—one has already gone to his reward—and all the superiors, who have, each in his own way, co-operated in this work. It is a day that must bring great joy to their hearts, and also to all the students of the College, as well as the whole priesthood of Ireland.

It is, therefore, fitting that with one voice, which is the voice of a nation, we should give glory to God to-day ; that we should thank Him for all He has done for us and for our fathers in the past, and that we should pray to Him with all the fervour of our souls for His light and help in the future. So King Solomon prayed in the name of all Israel when the Temple was dedicated ; and so also we all to-day, bishops, priests, and people, should pray to God in the name of the Irish Church and of the Irish nation. “ Give glory to God,

for He is good, for His mercy endureth for ever." Blessed are Thou, O Lord, the God of Israel, our Father from eternity to eternity. In Thy hand is power and might and greatness and empire over all things. Therefore, O Lord, we give Thee thanks to-day, and praise Thy glorious name. O Lord God, we confess that all this store, which we have given to build a house to Thy name, is from Thy hand. To thee, O Lord, we have given it in the simplicity and joy of our hearts; keep Thou for ever this purpose in our hearts; and let this mind always remain for the worship of Thee. And do thou, O Lord, look down propitious on this house, and fill it with Thy heavenly light:

Hæc templa, Rex caelestium,
Imple benigno lumine.

Mayest Thou open Thine eyes upon this house night and day; and graciously hear the prayers which Thy servants, the teachers and Levites of our Irish Church, will pray to Thee in this place. Make them worthy of their divine vocation; and renew for us all to-day the promise Thou didst make to King Solomon of old—"Mine eyes and my heart will be there always."¹

As for ourselves—incline our hearts to Thee, O Lord, that we may walk in all Thy ways, and keep Thy commandments, and Thy ceremonies and Thy judgments. O Lord, our God, Thou hast in Thy great mercy brought us out of the house of bondage, in which our fathers were oppressed; Thou hast raised up a fallen people and gathered together the scattered stones of Thy sanctuary; Thou hast rebuilt our temples and our altars in more than their ancient splendour; Thou hast in this great College renewed the olden glories of our Irish schools; and hast given us to-day to complete the work by dedicating this temple to the majesty of Thy name. O Lord, our God, be with us and our children in the future, even as Thou hast been with our fathers through all the dreadful past. Chastise us, if Thou wilt, for our sins; but chastise us in Thy mercy, and cast us not away from Thy face; but rather guard us with Thine own right hand, and keep us under the shadow of Thy wings, and so we may walk in the path of Thy commandments all the days of our lives, and thus be found worthy to join the choirs of our country's saints for ever in heaven.

¹ 3 *Kings* ix. 3.

WAS ST. CUTHBERT AN IRISHMAN?

IN the year 1887 was celebrated, on the 20th of March, the twelfth centenary festival of the great apostle of Northumbria. The occasion was rendered the more remarkable by a great Catholic pilgrimage to Holy Island, which did much to revive the memory of St. Cuthbert in the minds of the northern Catholics. During the year, too, we find that there were published or republished no less than three different lives of St. Cuthbert from Catholic sources. First of all we have had a third edition of Archbishop Eyre's *History of St. Cuthbert*. It was first published in 1849, whilst the author was still a young Northumbrian priest, and is in every respect a truly excellent work, and if we venture to differ from some of the learned prelate's conclusions, we do not the less admire the loving care and laborious research which are manifested throughout the entire book.

The Right Rev. Provost Consitt, of the diocese of Hexham and Newcastle, also published during the year a smaller, and for that reason, a more popular life of St. Cuthbert. The author has had some special facilities for the task, which he undertook at the request of the late Bishop Bewick, and with him also writing the history of St. Cuthbert seems to have been a labour of love.

Then, the Rev. Joseph Stevenson, S.J., gives us an excellent translation of Bede's prose life of St. Cuthbert. The life by Bede, so far as it goes, must always continue to be the most authoritative account of St. Cuthbert's history, for its author was not only a man of great learning and holiness, but he had also excellent opportunities of procuring the most accurate information regarding the life and virtues and miracles of the great Northumbrian apostle. Bede was about fourteen years old when Cuthbert died, so that he was a neighbour and almost a contemporary of the Bishop of Lindisfarne. Then, he had his information from men who knew St. Cuthbert well, especially from the priest Herefrith,¹ who

¹ Canon O'Hanlon in his *Life of St. Cuthbert* represents Bede as present at the death of Cuthbert. We know that Herefrith was present at the death scene, but we have no evidence that Bede, then a boy of only thirteen or fourteen, was present at that beautiful death on Farne Island.

had been for many years the intimate friend and companion of the Saint. Hence we think Father Stevenson has done well in giving to the public this excellent translation of Bede's Life of St. Cuthbert, for it would be impossible to find a more admirable specimen of religious biography.

We have, however, we are sorry to say, one complaint to make against all these learned writers. In our opinion none of them has fully and fairly discussed the question whether Cuthbert was of Irish birth or not. We have had so many saints of yore in Ireland, that we could very well afford to lend one to Northumbria without saying much about it. But Cuthbert is far too celebrated a saint to part with, especially if we are to get no credit for our generosity, and so I propose to state our claim and our complaint as clearly and as fairly as I can.

We complain then that these modern writers do not fairly discuss the question at the head of our article. On the contrary they rather quietly assume, and, as it appears to us, against the weight of evidence, that St. Cuthbert was of Northumbrian birth, and almost entirely ignore the arguments in favour of the Irish origin of the Saint. In this respect Skene, the learned author of *Celtic Scotland*, offers a very striking contrast even to our Catholic writers, and gives in his admirable sketch of St. Cuthbert abundant proofs of a judicial and impartial mind. He not only furnishes a most accurate, though necessarily brief, analysis of the "Irish Life" of St. Cuthbert, as it is called, but he also invites the reader's attention to the principal arguments, both for and against the authenticity of that most important document.

We regret that the learned Archbishop Eyre has not tried to investigate the authenticity of the Irish Life in the same patient and impartial spirit instead of referring his readers to Cardinal Moran and Mr. Skene. After what we cannot but think a brief and unsatisfactory reference to the question of Cuthbert's Irish birth, he sums up his own opinion by saying that "there can be no doubt that Cuthbert was born in Northumbria of Saxon parentage." In the previous paragraph the learned writer disposes of the *Irish Life* by observing that in all probability its author confounded Saint Cuthbert

with Saint Columba. "Columba," says Archbishop Eyre, "was born of noble descent at *Kells in Meath*, where his house is still shown and where no tradition of any kind connected with Cuthbert is known to exist." This statement was a great relief to our mind. Columba born in Kells! Every Irish scholar knows that he was the great grandson of Conal Gulban, that he was born at Gartan, in the heart of the tribeland of his royal ancestors in old Tirconnell, that he was baptised at Temple Douglas in the neighbourhood, and that he spent his early boyhood at Kilmacnenain, now called Kilmacrenan, in the same county Donegal.¹ This is not only the living tradition of the entire country, but the birth-place is expressly named in the old Irish Life of St. Columba, and indeed so far as we know has never before been questioned. St. Columba had indeed a "house" at Kells, but in accordance with a well-known Irish usage when speaking of saints, the *Teach* or "house" means the oratory and cell of the saint, not the place of his birth or the habitation of his family. We know too from the same old Irish Life of Columba, as well as from our Irish Annals, that the site of the "house" at Kells was given to Columba by King Diarmaid, with the consent of his son Aedh Slane, about the year 560, when Columba was 40 years old, and that it was given to him for the place of an oratory in atonement for an insult which the monarch had offered to Columba in the royal rath of Tara.

Monsignor Consitt dismisses the question of Cuthbert's birth-place in a still more summary, but at the same time in a more satisfactory fashion. "*We know nothing for certain*," he says, "of the birth and parentage of St. Cuthbert. Though many centuries later attempts were made to claim him as a native of Ireland, and to invest his infancy with a halo of romance, yet from the silence of his early biographers and contemporary writers we cannot attach much credence to the story." So far, this is fair enough, and the author adds that it is "probable," but as he says above, not at all certain, that he was born in Lauderdale.

The author of the article on Cuthbert in the new *Dictionary*

¹ See Reeves' *Adamnan*, page lxviii., and the *Irish Life* in Skene, vol. ii., p. 468.

of Christian Biography is still more confident in his assertions. He begins by saying that "Cuthbert, the great northern saint and bishop, was born in the first half of the seventh century in that district of ancient Northumbria which lies beyond the Tweed." The writer of this article is the Rev. James Raine, Canon of York, and yet in the library of the Dean and Canons of York is the oldest manuscript copy of that very "Irish Life" of Cuthbert, which cannot be rejected or ignored, without at the same time throwing doubt on several of the most authentic memorials of the ancient church of Durham. When we read these lives of Cuthbert, and the still shallower notices of the lives in some of our Catholic reviews, we thought it high time to state the evidence, such as it is, in favour of the Irish birth and parentage of the great St. Cuthbert.

And, first of all, in reply to the confident assertion of certain writers, that Cuthbert was of Northumbrian birth, it is well to say at once, leaving the "Irish Life" out of the question altogether, that any such statements are, as Monsignor Consitt admits, entirely unsupported by evidence. It is said the name is Saxon, but it is the Saxon equivalent of his Irish name; and though Bede says in one poetic passage that Britain produced (*genuit*) that radiant day-star to illuminate the Angles, the statement is perfectly true no matter where he was born, for at all events he received his religious training in Northumbria. Yet that is all that can be said in favour of his Northumbrian birth. Let us now hear the other side of the question.

It is remarkable that although, even from his own times, we have several different biographies of St. Cuthbert, yet except the authors of the "Irish Life," they are all silent about his birth-place and parentage!

The earliest account of the Saint is what is known as the "Anonymous Life." It was written about the year 700, that is about thirteen years after the death of Cuthbert. Bede embodied the substance of this treatise in his own larger work.

Bede wrote two different lives of Cuthbert besides the account which he gives of the Saint in his Ecclesiastical History. One, which seems to have been the earlier, was written in heroic metre. The language is choice and elegant, and in some passages reminds the reader of the grace and

tenderness of Virgil. It is in this Life that the passage occurs by which it is sought to prove that Cuthbert was of British origin—

“Nec jam orbis contenta sinu trans aequora lampas
Spargitur effulgens, hujusque Britannia consors
Temporibus genuit fulgur venerabile nostris,
Aurea qua Cuthbertus agens per sidera vitam
Scandere celsa suis docuit jam passibus Anglos.”

There is here no reference to his birth at all, but as both text and context clearly show, it refers merely to the sacred light of that effulgent lamp which rose in Britain's skies and taught the Angles to tread their lofty way to the golden stars. If Bede wished to make any reference to Cuthbert's birth-place, he would certainly have done so in the second or prose Life, which gives a much fuller and more complete account of the history and miracles of the Saint. This prose Life is a beautiful specimen both as to style and matter of religious biography, yet this strange fact stares us in the face, that although Bede's informants were the intimate associates of Cuthbert himself, both at Mailros and Lindisfarne, he makes no reference whatsoever to the birth, or parentage, or nationality of the saint. He does not undertake to tell us like modern writers, that he was born either in Northumbria or Lauderdale or anywhere else. He makes not even the slightest reference to his parents or to his family. But, after recording some miraculous stories of his youth, unconnected with any specified locality, he first introduces him to our notice as a youth (*adolescens*) tending his father's flocks on the banks of the river Leader, a river flowing into the Tweed, in the western part of Berwickshire.

“He [Bede]” says Skene, “must surely have known whether Cuthbert was of Irish descent or not. He is himself far too candid and honest an historian not to have stated the fact if it was so, and it is difficult to avoid the suspicion that this part of his narrative was one of the portions which he had expunged at the instance of the critics to whom he had submitted his manuscript.”¹ This is honest and judicious criticism, and it appears to us to suggest the only satisfactory explanation of Bede's strange silence regarding the parentage and nationality of St. Cuthbert. His birth, as we shall see,

¹ *Celtic Scotland*, vol. ii., page 205.

was illegitimate. His mother, indeed, was blameless, but, all the same, the great saint of Northumbria was the child of shame. It would, they thought, disedify simple souls to know the whole truth. The story of Cuthbert's birth in Ireland and the circumstances connected with it were known to comparatively few persons in Northumbria. Was it not better that it should continue so, than to run the risk of perhaps disedifying the faithful by a full narrative of the whole story ? So reasoned the good priest Herefrith, and likely some others also, and, as Bede himself not obscurely hints in his preface, they succeeded in persuading him to omit the precious chapter. "Moreover, when this book [the Life of Cuthbert] was completed, but not yet published, I frequently gave it to be perused both by the Very Rev. Priest Herefrith, when sojourning with us, and by others also who had lived for a long time with the man of God, and knew his life intimately, and I opportunely allowed what I wrote to be retouched [or perhaps expurgated, "*retractanda*,"] and some things, in deference to their suggestions, I carefully corrected, and thus having cut down to the naked facts [*ad purum*] all digressions likely to cause scruples, I have caused this undoubted narrative of the truth, expressed in simple language, to be committed to parchment, and carried into the presence of your brotherhood." ¹

This is a very significant passage and clearly shows that Bede had inserted in his narrative certain stories gathered, no doubt, from somewhat uncertain rumours regarding the early life of St. Cuthbert. But as these stories might be regarded, not only as somewhat doubtful, but also as rather disedifying, he was induced to omit them by Herefrith and some other associates of the Saint, who were more zealous for

¹ "At digesto opusculo, sed adhuc in schedulis retento, frequenter et Reverendissimo fratri nostro Herefrido presbytero huc adventanti, et aliis, qui diutius cum viro Dei conversati vitam illius optime noverant, quae scripsi legenda, atque ex tempore praestiti retractanda, ac nonnulla ad arbitrium prout videbantur, sedulo emendavi, sieque ablatis omnibus scrupulorum ambagibus ad purum, certam veritatis indaginem simplicibus explicatam sermonibus commendare membranis, atque ad vestrae quoque fraternitatis praesentiam adsportare curavi."—*Praefatio ad Vitam S. Cuthberti*.

We have given the original of this important passage in full, in order that our readers may judge for themselves as to the interpretation which we have given to the text of Bede.

the fair fame of their master than for the completeness of the narrative of his early life. The thing is done still by certain well-meaning persons who would surely make long excisions if they were ever authorised to prepare a new and improved edition of the Bible.

We now come to the "Irish Life" of St. Cuthbert, and as in the case of Bede's Lives we have it both in poetry and prose. The poetic life is evidently a versified reproduction of the Irish prose life, but it is equally emphatic in asserting the Irish birth and parentage of St. Cuthbert.

"Si cupis audire, Cuthberti miraque scire
Virtutis miræ, potes hunc sanctum reperire,
Sanctus Cuthbertus Anglorum tutor apertus
Regis erat natus et Hybernicus est generatus."

There is a copy of this poetic life in Leonine metre in the British Museum (Titus A. II. 2), which unfortunately wants five leaves, to the great grief of some admirer of the Saint, who has inserted the following note in the manuscript—"Here wants fyve leaves, for which I wold gev fyve ould angells." How they loved God's saints in those glorious "ould" Catholic days in England!

The prose "Irish Life," it must be remembered, is so called, not because it is written in the Irish language, but because it professes to give from Irish sources the history of the birth and parentage of St. Cuthbert. Its author calls it *Libellus de ortu S. Cuthberti de Historiis Hybernensium excerptus et translatus*. Colgan gives a version of this Life in his *Acta Sanctorum*, but it was taken from Capgrave, and Capgrave seems to have derived his version from John of Tinmouth, both being in all probability inaccurate copies of the same original. The fairest copy of that life is now preserved in the library of the Dean and Chapter of York, and was first accurately published by the Surtees Society in 1835¹ (*Biogr. Misc.* pp. 63, 87.)

Some modern writers have rejected the authenticity of this Irish Life mainly, we suspect, because it relates the Irish origin of St. Cuthbert. The Bollandist writer (*Vita S. Cuth.*,

¹ There is another manuscript copy in the British Museum (Titus A. II. 3), but it was evidently made from the York manuscript or from the same original.

20 Martii) also regards it as untrustworthy, on the ground of certain alleged anachronisms and inconsistencies in the narrative. "Let the Irish," he says, "keep their squalling Nulluhoc to themselves, and leave Cuthbert to the Anglo-Saxons." Later on, however, the Bollandists seemed to have changed their minds, for at the Life of St. Wiro, they merely regard the Irish origin of Cuthbert as doubtful. The Surtees editor, however, admits that "the 'Irish Life' is a regular biography, written in a good style, and not deficient in incidental information on the subjects connected with the periods in which it was written."

The "Irish Life" of St. Cuthbert has been printed from a codex containing several tracts, dealing chiefly with the history of the Church of Durham and its holy patron, and all copied, though mostly in different hands, during the course of the fourteenth century. The "Irish Life" is No. 8 in this collection, and was in all probability written by Reginald, prior of Coldingham, who is the admitted author of treatise No. 6 in the same collection, *Libellus de miraculis S. Cuthberti secundum Reginaldum de Coldingham*. The entire codex was compiled by the Benedictines of Durham and of Coldingham in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and next to the body of St. Cuthbert himself, it seems to have been regarded as the greatest treasure of their church and monastery. The copy now at York was probably made for Mathew of Durham, and was carried to York by that prelate, when he was translated to the archiepiscopal see. In this way, although the original Durham codices are probably lost for ever, the present copy came to be preserved at York.¹

¹ The York MS. XVI. I. contains the following treatises :—

1. *De Statu et Episcopis Ecclesiae Hagustaldensis (Hexham).*
2. *Eatae Episcopi Hagustaldensis vita.*
3. *Reliquiae quae in Ecclesia Dunelmensi servantur.*
4. *De aribus Cuthberti in Insula Farne.*
5. *De Remissione Peccatorum.*
6. *Libellus de miraculis S. Cuthberti secundum Reginaldum de Coldingham.*
7. *De Episcopis Lindisfarnensis Ecclesiae usque ad Eanbertum.*
8. *Libellus de ortu S. Cuthberti de Historiis Hybernensium excerptus et translatus.*
9. *De translatione Corporis S. Cuthberti.*
- 10, 11, 12. *The histories of Coldingham, Graystones, and Chambre.*

Now, it is very singular that our modern critics should admit the authenticity of all the other treatises in this collection and reject the authority of the "Irish Life" alone, especially as the author of the "Irish Life" seems beyond any reasonable doubt to be that very Reginald of Coldingham, who composed treatise No. 6 on the miracles of St. Cuthbert contained in this very manuscript. Reginald was not an Irishman, and that is just what we should infer from the uncouth fashion in which he latinises several proper names in the "Irish Life." And in the preface the writer of that Life identifies himself pretty clearly as the author of the treatise on the miracles of St. Cuthbert. He tells us that "after revolving in my mind for many years what my pen might hand down to posterity in honour of St. Cuthbert, and diligently investigating the many wondrous miracles hitherto unrecorded, which the Saint had wrought, I composed a 'Libellus' on the subject," which was exhibited to his friends and which is, no doubt, that very *Libellus de miraculis S. Cuthberti secundum Reginaldum de Coldingham*, which we find in the York manuscript.

The writer then goes on to say in the preface to the "Irish Life"—"It was whilst engaged in these studies that a certain pamphlet [*quaterniuncula*] fell into my hands, which stated that St. Cuthbert was born in Ireland, of a kingly race, and clearly showed how it was that he came to the borders of Anglia. Just then it came to pass that St. Cuthbert himself, aiding our pious purposes, sent to our house [*nobis*] a holy and learned Irishman, Eugenius Episcopus Harundinensis (elsewhere Hardionensis), whose testimony corroborated what we had already learned from the pamphlet regarding the birth of St. Cuthbert. Moreover, he told us many other wondrous things, of which we had previously known nothing, for he not only asserted that he [Cuthbert] was undoubtedly [*verissime*] born in Ireland of a royal race, but he also more clearly than anyone else explained to us the name of the place and the name of the city, of which we had previously known nothing. And, amongst other things, he said that King Muriedach was his father, a prince who had justly reduced all Ireland under his sovereign sway, and that his mother

was Sabina, a woman remarkable for sanctity, whose memory was honoured, and whose relics were preserved in the churches of her own country." The writer then adds that this account was confirmed by the testimony (*attestationem*) of Archbishop Matthias, and of the bishops, Saint Malachy, Gilbert and Alan, and also of some other aged priests and monks, disciples of the aforesaid Malachy, so that in all security he composed this "Irish Life," relying on the testimony of these men.

Such is the preface to the "Irish Life," and it is surely difficult to find a clearer or more straightforward statement. Of course there is some difficulty of identifying the Irish names in the Latin dress of a foreign writer. Still, there can hardly be any mistake made about them by those who are familiar with Irish history.

Eugenius, mentioned in this preface, was bishop of Ardmore, and is said to have written a Life of St. Cuthbert. He flourished about the period of Strongbow's invasion, and was the last prelate of St. Declan's ancient see, which was shortly afterwards united to Waterford. Matthias was probably Mathew O'Heney, Archbishop of Cashel, who flourished towards the end of the twelfth century. He was a Cistercian monk, and, no doubt, was personally acquainted with the Benedictines of Durham. He also wrote a Life of St. Cuthbert, and we may be pretty sure that he sent a copy to the famous monastery where the body of the Saint was then enclosed in the splendid shrine that was afterwards destroyed by the agents of Henry VIII. Alan is supposed ¹ to have been Albinus O'Mulloy, abbot of Baltinglass and afterwards bishop of Ferns, and, like O'Heney, was a great Irish scholar. It is likely that the testimony (*attestationem*) of St. Malachy and of Gilbert, bishop of Limerick, of which the author speaks, was a written statement of these saints, or, perhaps, orally communicated to him by the *aged* priests, their disciples, whom he mentions; for the saints themselves must have been dead some thirty or forty years previously. It is not impossible, however, that Reginald, supposing him to have written the "Irish Life" even so late as 1180, might

¹ See Cardinal Moran's *Irish Saints in Great Britain*, page 272.

have himself seen and conversed with Christian and Malachy in his youth.

In this preface, the author says that a certain Muriedach, king of Ireland, was father of St. Cuthbert. This statement has caused some chronological difficulties. It is evident, however, *from the Life itself*, that the word "father" here must be understood in a wide sense, and is simply equivalent to saying that Cuthbert was a MacMuiredach, which was probably the expression used, or intended by his informants, and which he translated after his own fashion in the Latin. For, in the second chapter of the *Life*, it is not Muriedach, the just king of Ireland, but the cruel king of Connathe, who is represented as the father of Cuthbert. The statement in the preface, therefore, simply means that Cuthbert, through his mother Sabina was of the Hy-Muiredach race, and we shall show that this expression has been actually used about that period in our annals in reference to the descendants of this same Muriedach.

Muiredach, grandson of Niall of the Hostages, married Erca, the beautiful daughter of Loarn, a prince of Scottish Dalriada, and through this union became the father of the senior line of Hy-Niall kings. His son Muircertach, to whom probably our author refers, was for many years supreme king of Ireland, and the Hector of the Hy-Niall race, until he was treacherously "slain, burned, and drowned" in a vat of wine whilst trying to save himself from the flames of his burning house, which was fired over his head on November night, in the year 533.¹ His son Baedan and his nephew, Eochaidh Finn, succeeded to the throne as joint kings in 570, but were both slain in 572 or 573, and it is remarkable that the accurate *Chronicon Scotorum*, in recording their death, describes them as "two of the Hy-Muiredach," which shows that even then that branch of the Hy-Nialls was so described. If, as Colgan thinks, Sabina was a daughter of this Baedan and a grand-daughter of Muircertach, the renowned king of Ireland, and was very young at the time of her father's murder, she could have been mother of St.

¹ The Four Masters have 527, but the *Annals of Ulster* has 533—the true date.

Cuthbert, at least if the Saint were born in the early years of the seventh century. And what lends some plausibility to this view is that the slayer of Baedan was king of *Ciannacht*, which is remarkably like the king of *Connathe*, who was father of Cuthbert, according to the "Irish Life."

There is, however, a subsequent entry in the annals which in our opinion throws a flood of light on the facts recorded in the "Irish Life." It is given thus in the *Chronicon Scotorum* at the year corresponding with 620 A.D.—"Murder of the family of Baedan in Magh Lecet (*recte* Mag Slecht) in the territory of Connaught—viz., Aillil, son of Baedan; Maelduin, son of Fergus, son of Baedan, and of Dicuil," so that the race of Baedan Mac Hy-Muiredach was nearly extirpated on this occasion.

Let us now see how this remarkable entry corroborates the statements in the Irish Life of St. Cuthbert, which expressly appeals to the authority of the most ancient annals of Ireland. It is in substance as follows :—

"There was a king who reigned in the city of Lainestri. This king was treacherously attacked by a neighbouring prince who ruled over Connathe and who slew him *and all his family*, except one tender virgin (*tenerissima puellula*), whom for shame sake he spared, but whom he carried off as a prisoner to his own territory. She became an attendant on his queen, but rejecting the king's unlawful love, the latter at length forcibly gratified his passion. The maiden was then sent to the king's mother, who dwelt with her at a religious house near Kenanus under the protection of a certain bishop, who at the king's request took charge of the child when he was born, and had him baptised under the name of Mullucc at a place called Hartlbrechins (Ardbraccan).¹ This city of Kenanus is in the region called Media, a district rich in fertile pastures and in cattle, and in flowing streams and rivers, one of which called the Mana flows by that city of Kenanus, and abounds in all kinds of fish."

This is a natural and consistent narrative, and contains many incidental touches that go far of themselves to prove that it is genuine. If a forger wished to invent a royal parentage for St. Cuthbert, he would never have done it in this fashion, and if he did, it never would have been accepted as authentic by the monks of Durham, unless it were confirmed by the living tradition of that great monastery. Neither is it difficult to reconcile this narrative with the admitted facts of Irish chronology and history.

¹ The bishop's name is not given here, but elsewhere he is called Eugenius

St. Cuthbert died in 687, in *senili actate* according to Bede. He was an *adolescens* in 651, when according to the same authority he entered the monastery of Mailros. In that case we may fairly fix his birth about 625—four or five years after that slaughter of the race of Baedan Hy-Muiredach described in our Annals. Baedan's son Aillil was probably that King of Lainestri to whom the Life refers, and his daughter Sabina having been spared at the murder of her family was carried off in the manner described. That murder took place in Magh Slecht, near Fenagh, in Connaught, and—although it is not expressly stated—no doubt, Aedh Finn, King of North Connaught at that time, was the real author of the crime. Kells (Kenamus), too, was within his jurisdiction, or on the borders of his territory, for the princes of Breiffney, ruled almost from sea to sea. Lainestri is an attempt at writing Leinster, that is the Irish *Laighen* with the Danish suffix *ster* signifying a place. Connathe is, of course, Connaught, and Media is Meath, the fertile district with its fish-abounding rivers.

The "Irish Life" then describes how after the death of the holy bishop who protected them, Sabina fearing doubtless for the life of her son fled secretly with the child, and reaching the sea-shore took passage and succeeded at first in landing "at Galweia in the region called Renii," which, as Skene points out, was doubtless Portpatrick, in the Kinns of Galloway—the nearest Scottish land to Ireland. But Sabina was anxious, it would seem, to reach her countrymen in the Scottish Dalriada, so with a few companions she sailed northwards and "landed at a harbour called Letherpen in Erregaithle, a land of the Scots." "This harbour was," the writer adds, "between Erregaithle and Incegal, near a lake called Loicafan." This minute description borne out, too, by actual facts, does not look like an attempt at forging a story five hundred years after the alleged events took place. The harbour referred to was probably the northern angle of Lough Crinan, in Argyle, close to Lough Awe, not far from Dunadd, a strong fortress built on a rock, in the middle of the great Moss of Crinan. It was then the capital of the Scottish Dalriada. Here, however, on landing, Sabina and

her child narrowly escaped being robbed and murdered. So they made their way we know not how to the borders of "Scotia," which did not then include Argyle, and were kindly received by Columba, first bishop of Dunkeld. St. Columba of Iona was then dead, and moreover was not a bishop, so that this Columba, or Columbanus, must be one of the numerous prelates who bore that name, several of whom may have preached in Scotland. The boy was educated for some time together with an Irish girl called Brigid, under the care of this holy bishop—who told Cuthbert that Providence destined him to preach amongst the Angles, but that Brigid was reserved by God for the western Irish. It has been said that this refers to St. Brigid of Kildare, and is a manifest anachronism seeing that she died more than 100 years before. We know however, that no less than seven or eight saints who bore this name are mentioned in our martyrologies,¹ so that it is quite gratuitous assumption to suppose that the reference is to Saint Brigid of Kildare.

We are then told that Sabina and her son paid a visit to the monastery of Iona, where no doubt they were kindly received by the abbot who was descended like Sabina herself from the great mother of their race Erca, the daughter of Loarn Mor. After remaining some time in Iona, both mother and son left the island, and Sabina succeeded in finding her two brothers Maeldan and Aetan, "who," we are told "were both bishops having episcopal sees in the land of the Scots." This is an interesting statement, for we know from our martyrologies that there were two saints, one called Maeldan or Mellan, and the other Aetan or Aedan, who are both described as belonging to the island of Inchiquin, in Lough Corrib,² and were most likely brothers. It seems the island took its name from these two saints—Inch-Hy-Cuinn—and that they derived this name from their great ancestor Conn the Hundred-Fighter. There is hardly a doubt that they belonged to the family of that Baedan to whom we have already referred, and it may be that they left Inchiquin after the slaughter of their kindred, and retired to the more friendly land of

¹ Colgan names fourteen.

² St. Mældan's natalis is the 7th of February; St. Aetan's the 9th of October. See Colgan *Acta SS.*, and the *Martyrology of Donegal*.

the Scots, to preach the Gospel to the heathen. We know, too, from the life of St. Fursey, that Maeldan of Inchiquin, was his soul's friend or spiritual director, and that he and no doubt his brother also, were raised to the episcopal dignity. At this time, however, these prelates were probably old men, but they readily took charge of Cuthbert and placed the boy under the special tuition of a holy man in Lothian, where a church, called Childeschirche, was according to the Life afterwards founded in honour of St. Cuthbert. That name, says Skene, is now corrupted into Channelkirk, which is to this day the name of a parish in the north-western corner of Berwickshire, near the head waters of the river Leader. And so the "Irish Life" brings young Cuthbert to the very place where Bede takes up the narrative of his life, when he was a young shepherd tending his flocks on the banks of the Leader, among the southern slopes of the Lammermoor hills. Sabina herself freed from any further anxiety in reference to her son, for whom she had dared and suffered so much, went, it is said, on a pilgrimage to Rome, but she afterwards returned to Ireland, where after some years' sojourn in a religious house she died a most holy death. Her name is said to be commemorated in some martyrologies on the 5th November.¹

We shall now examine the collateral evidence that goes to confirm this account of the birth and parentage of St. Cuthbert contained in the "Irish Life" of the Saint.

First of all, it was the constant tradition of the Church of Durham itself that Cuthbert was of Irish parentage. Of this we have fortunately very satisfactory evidence in a work published so long ago as 1672, and known as *The Ancient Rites and Monuments of the Monastic and Cathedral Church of Durham*. Walter Skirlaw was Bishop of Durham from 1388 to 1405, and was succeeded by Cardinal Thomas Langley, who ruled the See from 1406 to 1435. These two munificent prelates did much for the adornment of the church and monastery, in reference to whom the *Rites of Durham* says:—"The two bishops [Skirlaw and Langley] were the two first founders and builders of the said cloisters, and did bear all the charges of the building and workmanship of the said

¹ See Colgan's *Notes to the Vita Secunda*.

work, and were the first that did cause from the cloister door to the church door to be set in glass in the window the whole story and miracles of that holy man, St. Cuthbert, from the day of his birth to his dying day. And there you might have seen his mother lying in childbed, and how after she was delivered the bright beams did shine from heaven upon her, and upon the child as he lay in the cradle, in so much that to every man's thinking the Holy Spirit had overshadowed him, for every one that did see it thought that the house had been all on fire, the beams did shine so bright over all the house within and without, and the bishop baptised the child and called him Yullock [*recte* Mullucc] in the Irish tongue—in English Cuthbert. The bishop's name who baptised and had the keeping of the goodly child was Eugenius, the name of the city where he was baptised was Hardbrecunb, for he was blessed of God even from his mother's womb." ¹

So these two bishops of the Church of Durham had the miracles and other circumstances attending the birth of Cuthbert, at Kells, as narrated in the "Irish Life," set in the stained glass from the cloister to the church. His baptismal name too, we are told, was that given in the "Irish Life," and is equivalent in meaning to the Saxon "Cuthbert." Much is sometimes made of this Saxon name as indicating a Saxon origin. Here we have the ancient and simple explanation. Cuthbert's baptismal name *Mullucc*, from *mo* and *uallach*, means, "my proud or privileged one,"—*mo* being the usual prefix of endearment, and *ullach* from the root *uall* meaning "one specially privileged," as the miracles attending his birth showed that Cuthbert was so favoured by God. "Cudberet" means the same in Anglo-Saxon—"one illustrious for his gifts," or for "his skill," and we know that it was not only very natural but also very common, to have proper names thus translated into the language of the speakers. Even still it is quite usual in Ireland to change the old Irish name into its corresponding equivalent in English, and sometimes both are in use—the one with the Irish and the other with the English speaking people.

¹ *Surtees*, vol. ii., p. x

We know also from the same *Rites of Durham* that amongst the "inscriptions beneath the figures of such monks of the Benedictine Order as were painted upon the screen work of the altar of St. Jerome and St. Benedict" was the following in reference to Cuthbert:—

"Sanctus Cuthbertus patronus ecclesiae, civitatis, et libertatis Dunelmensis, natione Hibernus, regiis parentibus ortus, nutu Dei Angliam perductus et apud Mailros monachus est effectus,¹ &c., &c." There can be no doubt, therefore, that the "Irish Life" was received as authentic by the monks and prelates of Durham.

Even at a still earlier period, long before the founding of Durham, the same belief in the Irish birth of Cuthbert seems to have prevailed in the community of Lindisfarne over which the Saint had presided for several years. It is well known that the monastery and see of Lindisfarne were founded by an Irish monk from Iona, the blessed Aidan, whose genealogy is given in the ancient *Feilire of Aengus* written about the beginning of the ninth century.² His immediate successors Finan, Colman, and Tuda, were all Irishmen too. When Colman was worsted at the Conference of Whitby, and refused to accept the new discipline on the Easter question, he returned to Lindisfarne, and taking up from the grave the bones of the blessed Aidan he, with his Irish brethren and many Saxon monks, retired at first to Iona, and afterwards, as we are told in the *Irish Annals*, he sailed away with his relics and his monks to the storm-swept Inisbofin on the coast of Mayo, where they were free to follow their ancient discipline and live and die in peace.

Tuda, Colman's successor, was, as Bede tells us, a southern Irishman, and readily accepted the new discipline. So also did Cuthbert. But in the history of the wanderings of his body there is one incident which strikingly reminds us of Colman's voyage to the far west of Ireland, bearing with him his most precious treasure, the bones of the blessed Aidan. When the incursions of the Danes made it impossible to remain any longer with safety at Lindisfarne Cuthbert's

¹ *Rites of Durham*, page 112.

² August 31st, Aedan, the bright sun of Inis Medcoit. See *Gloss*.

body too was taken up from the grave, fresh and incorrupt, as on the day he died. For seven years his faithful children bore that priceless treasure over the hills and valleys of Northumbria, but could nowhere find a home or a secure refuge. Then Bishop Eardulf and Abbot Eadred took counsel together, and they resolved to cross over to Ireland, bearing with them, as Colman did, the body of their sainted father to rest, it seems, with kindred dust. But such was not the will of Providence. The vessel in which they embarked was driven back to Galloway by a furious storm, and they themselves, having narrowly escaped shipwreck, knelt down on the shore beside the body of the Saint and humbly asked pardon of God and of Cuthbert for making the rash attempt.

But why, we ask, attempt to fly to Ireland ? The Danes were there in 881, and many years previously, ravaging as remorselessly as ever they did in Northumbria ; why not rather fly to Pictland or to Argyle, or to some district of southern England ? Why—except that they knew the Saint was of Irish birth, and having the example of Colman before their eyes they thought perhaps that it was God's purpose that the body of the blessed Cuthbert should be carried home to his native land ? We do not urge this as of itself a convincing argument ; but we think it lends much probability to the story of Cuthbert's Irish birth. And we know the same thing happened not only in the case of St. Aidan, but also in the case of the great founder of Iona himself ; it was to his native Ireland his bones were brought by his monks when the Danes were harrying the islands of the western seas.

There are many circumstances, too, connected with the religious life of Cuthbert which clearly point to his Celtic origin. When he resolved to devote his life to the service of God in a religious house it was to an Irish monastery he came, for Mailros on the Tweed was in reality an Irish house. It was founded from Iona by an Irishman, and even in 651 its spirit, its discipline, and most of its monks too, were still Irish, as was also the case both at Iona and at Lindisfarne. This was not the great Cistercian house, that " fair Melrose," whose ruins have been glorified for ever by the genius of Sir Walter

Scott. The Irish monastery of old Melrose, founded by St. Aidan and his Irish monks, was situated about two miles further east on the southern bank of the Tweed, which at this point takes a bold sweep to the south around the promontory on which the monastery was built. "On the further shore the river is overhung by lofty precipitous banks, and was strongly guarded by natural defences on every quarter except the south, where a wall was drawn across the isthmus." Eata, one of the twelve Saxon boys trained by St. Aidan, was then Abbot of Melrose, but Boisil, a priest of great holiness, was its prior; and it was to this holy monk that Cuthbert made application to be received amongst the brethren of the order in the year 651. "Cuthbert," says Bede, "was at this time keeping watch over the flocks committed to his charge on certain remote mountains" which we know from the "Anonymous Life," were the southern slopes of the Lammermoor Hills, overlooking the upper valley of the river Leader. This stream flows southward through the west of Berwickshire, and falls into the Tweed close to Old Melrose. It is sometimes inferred from the fact of Cuthbert being a shepherd in this locality that he was a native of Lauderdale. By similar reasoning it might be inferred that St. Patrick was a native of the Co. Antrim, because we find him in his youth herding swine for his master on the slopes of the Slemish. How Cuthbert came to the parish of Channelkirk in Berwickshire, we are told in the "Irish Life," and Bede tells the rest. One night on the mountains, the 31st August, 651, when his companions were asleep and he alone wakeful, "he saw a long stream of light break through the darkness, and a glorious company of angels first descending to the earth, and then returning back with a glorified spirit of surpassing brightness, whom they were escorting to his heavenly home." When morning was come Cuthbert went and made inquiry and soon found that it was the blessed Aidan of Lindisfarne who died on that night, and whose soul he saw going to heaven in such radiant glory. This narrative seems to imply that Cuthbert had previously known something of the life and virtues of Aidan, which is not unlikely. His resolution, however, was taken at once.

He delivered up to their owner the sheep that he was feeding on the mountains, and riding down the valley of the Leader he came straight to the gates of Mailros, and was at once admitted by the blessed Boisil, who was probably an Irishman, into the community, and shortly after receiving the Irish tonsure became a monk of Mailros.

Some ten years later Eata, the Abbot of Mailros, was sent to found the monastery of Ripon in Yorkshire. He took Cuthbert along with him, and gave him the responsible office of guest-master in the new community. But they introduced into Ripon the Irish discipline as still practised at Mailros, in consequence of which, after the return of Wilfrid, they were driven away from the Yorkshire monastery and returned to Mailros. This was in 661, three years before the Conference of Whitby, after which the Irish houses of Mailros and Lindisfarne first began to give up their Celtic practices, especially in the matter of Easter and the frontal tonsure so characteristic of the early Irish monks. It is remarkable that Bede in giving an account of the expulsion of Cuthbert and his community, describes them as following the doctrine of the Irish (Scoti). "King Alchfrid," he says, "gave him [Wilfrid] a monastery of thirty families at a place called Wrypum, which place he had lately given to those who had followed the doctrine of the Irish (Scoti) to build a monastery upon. But for as much as they afterwards being left to their choice would rather quit the place than adopt the Catholic Easter and other canonical rites according to the Roman and Apostolic Church, he gave the same to him [Wilfrid]." ¹ This passage still shows how tenaciously the community at Mailros adhered to these Irish practices of their mother house of Iona.

But Cuthbert had not the same unyielding, not to say stubborn, spirit as Colman. After the Conference of Whitby and the death of Tuda, Colman's successor, who died of the plague a few months after his appointment to the see of Lindisfarne, he was himself sent as prior to that island, and readily yielded obedience to the new discipline, and furthermore, by his patient firmness succeeded in inducing the

¹ Bede : *Hist.* Book v., c. 19.

entire community to accept it. "And although," says Bede, "there were some brethren in the monastery who preferred their Irish ancient customs to the new discipline, he soon got the better of these by his moderation and his patience, and by daily practice at length brought them round to the better system which he had in view."

Cuthbert having spent twelve years as prior of Lindisfarne, with the permission of the abbot and the sanction of his religious brethren resolved to devote himself entirely to divine contemplation in absolute retirement. The life of an anchorite has been generally considered in the Church the most perilous, but at the same time the most perfect manner of life. "The farther from men the nearer to God," was a maxim of the Egyptian solitaries, and was also a recognised principle of the Celtic saints. The most perfect amongst them always longed to escape from community life, and give their whole thoughts and hearts to God in perfect solitude. So in thus retiring from the monastery Cuthbert gives a new proof that he was animated by the spirit of his Celtic race and kindred. At first he used to retire at intervals to a small island quite close to the monastery of Lindisfarne, but there he was constantly liable to interruption both from strangers and from his monastic brethren. So he resolved to leave the monastery for good, and to retire to a place where there would be no danger of further intrusion. For this purpose he chose as his place of retirement the small rocky islet of Farne, one of a group of similar islands in the open sea about seven miles south-east of Lindisfarne, and two miles from the mainland at the royal castle of Bamborough. It was a lonely and utterly desolate island without water, trees, or fruits, and commonly said to be haunted by evil spirits, so that no one had hitherto dared to remain in it for any length of time except St. Aidan, who used sometimes retire to the place, like St. Cuthbert, to be alone with God. Here Cuthbert built himself a little cell and oratory; which in the Irish fashion he surrounded with a circular rath, or rather a *cashiol*, for the rampart was built of stones and earth about six feet high on the outside, but rendered still higher on the inside by the excavation of the rocky soil to furnish materials

for the wall. This was the invariable method of building adopted by the Irish Celts, and shows that in this, as in other respects, Cuthbert retained the usages and traditions of his Celtic kindred. "The building," says Bede, "is almost of a round form, from wall to wall about four or five poles in extent. The wall on the outside is higher than a man, but within by excavating the rock he made it much deeper to prevent the eyes and the thoughts from wandering, that they might be wholly bent on heavenly things, and the pious inhabitant might behold nothing from his residence but the heavens above him." In reading this description of Cuthbert's enclosure one would think that Bede had been describing one of the similar enclosures erected by Brendan, Enda, and Colman on the islands of the western coast of Ireland where they are still to be seen in the ruins.

From this blessed solitude the Saint was most reluctantly taken away to be made Bishop of Lindisfarne. For two years he laboured with unremitting zeal in the discharge of his episcopal duties, and even in that brief period he wrought a great and lasting change for the better throughout his entire diocese. But now his strength began to fail, and feeling his end approaching he once more retired to his beloved retreat on Farne Island. It was about Christmas in the year 686 that Cuthbert took his farewell of the brethren of Lindisfarne and finally retired to his solitary cell to die. All hearts were filled with sorrow for they felt they would see their beloved father no more amongst them. He lingered on, however, for two months more in his lonely island gradually growing weaker, and then towards the middle of March it became apparent to the brethren who came to visit him that the end was at hand.

There is no more touching passage in the *Lives of the Saints* than that in which the sympathetic pen of Bede describes the beautiful death of Cuthbert in his cell on Farne Island. The poor wasted body was weak unto death from disease and lack of nourishment, but his spirit was strong within him, and the light of God was shining in his eyes. "Know and remember," he said amongst other things, and in a truly prophetic spirit, "that if of two evils hereafter you

must choose one, I would much prefer that taking me up out of the tomb and bearing my bones away with you, you should leave this place and reside wherever God may direct you, than that you should consent in any way to the wickedness of schismatics and place a yoke upon your own necks."

Nearly two hundred years afterwards when the ruthless Danes descended upon Lindisfarne these words of the dying Saint were remembered, his blessed body was taken up incorrupt from the grave, and borne by willing hands and faithful hearts up and down through hill and vale, by lake and stream, over all the wide bounds of Northumbria, until after 113 years it found its final resting place in Durham's stately fane. There it was enshrined for 700 years more, down to the day, when the commissioners of Henry VIII. visited the cathedral, desecrated the shrine, and profaned the holy corpse of St. Cuthbert. But since that evil day no one can say with certainty where his sacred relics rest.

In conclusion, we have only to add that the weight of authority, as well as the weight of evidence, are entirely in favour of the Irish origin of the Saint. The oldest and the best authorities both of Scotland and England, as well as of Ireland, were in favour of that opinion. Colgan, whose honesty is above suspicion, and whose competence to pronounce a judgment will not be questioned, expressly declares that, with the exception of a few (Dempster, Pitsaeus, Wion and Possevin)—and those men of no great repute for scholarship—all other writers, and especially the English writers down to his time, who refer to the native country of Cuthbert, *unanimously* assert that he was an Irishman. "Omnes tamen alii et praesertim Angli, ad nostram usque aetatem qui de S. Cuthberti patria mentionem fecerint unanimi consensu et sine controversia Hibernum fuisse contestantur."¹ In face of this declaration we think it unnecessary to cite the testimonies of these ancient writers, and we are content to leave the intelligent reader to judge for himself how far certain recent authors are justified in their confident statements regarding the birthplace of the greatest of the Northumbrian saints.

¹ *Acta SS.*, 695.

COUNTY GALWAY ARCHÆOLOGY.¹

I HAVE been requested to deliver what some people call an inaugural address, but what may be more modestly described as a brief explanation of the aims and methods of our young association. At our first meeting in the Railway Hotel, I recollect some gentlemen asked if anyone could explain to them what precisely were the objects we had in view in founding this association. Well, that is the question which I propose to answer this evening—to explain the nature of the work we have undertaken, the objects we have in view in undertaking it, and the means and methods which we hope to employ in its prosecution. Our prospectus states that we have a three-fold end in view—the investigation of the history, of the archæology, and of the folk-lore of the County Galway and its neighbourhood. We add the last word because the boundaries of the county, like the Shannon for instance, have been the theatre of several most interesting events, the scenes of which cannot be restricted to one locality, for very often they begin in one county, were then continued in another, and were even sometimes shifted to a third.

Now, speaking first of history, the history we have to deal with is what is commonly called local history—that is to say, history treating of things which took place in our own part of the country, but which at the time were often things of national interest and importance. Amongst these, epoch-making battles hold a first place. Such, for instance, were the famous fields of Knockmoy, Knocktuagh, and Aughrim; whilst in bardic and pre-historic times we have the celebrated battles of Magh Mucrive and of South Moytura, near Cong, in each of which a kingdom, as at Aughrim, was lost and won. The bardic tales describing these battles still exist, and one of the most valuable things a Galway antiquary could do would be to go over the ground with these tales in

¹Inaugural Address at the First Meeting of the County Galway Archæological and Historical Society, in the rooms of the Royal Galway Institution, on the 23rd July, 1900.

his hand, and try to ascertain how far the bardic accounts are verified by the evidence of existing monuments. Sir William Wilde has to some extent tried to do this in regard to the battle of Moytura, in his most interesting work on Lough Corrib, which, in my opinion, is itself an admirable specimen of local descriptive history, and affords an excellent model for local investigators. But in many other respects local history affords a very wide and varied field of historical inquiry. It treats of the history of the ruling families of the county in ancient times, and of what are called the county families in modern times. It tells us all that now can be gleaned of innumerable churches and abbeys which our fathers founded, and where their ashes rest under the shadow of their ivy-clad walls. It tells us who built the many strong castles that crowd our Galway plains, and in silent and lonely grandeur still plead haughtily for the glories that are gone. It tells us of the fierce conflicts that were fought beneath their battlements, and even gives us glimpses of the mail-clad knights and stately dames who once revelled in their halls. In reference to all these things, political, social, and military, you will find most interesting local information in the State Papers, published and unpublished, and also in the family records of the more ancient houses, if they are carefully and patiently examined, and published in our journal. Moreover, it is the duty of the local historian to give us full and accurate accounts of all the worthies of the County Galway who have flourished in the past—its saints, its scholars, its prelates, its artists, its writers, its warriors: and I can assure you that in my opinion this County of Galway can exhibit as full and as fair a list of distinguished men in all these spheres of action as, perhaps, any other county in Ireland. The materials at our disposal, too, for this purpose are very ample. We have several most valuable historical and topographical treatises like the book of Hy Many, the great book of Duniry, the topographical poems of O'Dugan of Ballydoogan, and others of like character, written in ancient Gaelic, which contain much valuable matter regarding our county, some of it yet unpublished, and all of it needing further elucidation. We have also many

excellent local histories like O'Flaherty's and Hardiman's and Dr. Fahey's, which contain much instructive and interesting matter, and are valuable as suggesting to younger inquirers on what lines further investigations into our sacred and profane history should be carried on. So there can be no doubt that the County Galway affords a wide historical field for the exercise of pen, pencil, and photographic lens in the description and illustration of all the monuments and occurrences already referred to.

Then, in the second place, we undertake the study of the Antiquities or Archæology of the County Galway, and here I fancy I hear several persons saying in their own minds : " We know very well what is meant by local history, but will you kindly explain to us clearly what is meant by the study of archæology ? What are its objects and methods ? " Well, I shall try to do so, not too learnedly, but as clearly as I can. Its name implies that archæology is " the science of things that are old "—not of living old men and women, but of all human remains, including those of man himself, that have come down to us from the distant past. The expression, " human remains," must be understood in its widest sense. It means the products of human labour, and includes, first of all, what are called " structural remains," that is, buildings or other artificial constructions of every kind designed for domestic, military, religious, or sepulchral purposes. You will perceive at once what a vast collection of ancient monuments is comprised in this class of structural remains. Castle, rath, dun, and cromlech, military structures—like Dun Aengus in Aran—druidical circles, sepulchral cairns, chambered mounds—like the great cities of the dead at Knowth and Dowth, as old and as wonderful, but not so mighty as the pyramids—beehive cells, or cloghans, ancient churches, round towers, mediæval monasteries and castles. They are all structural remains of the past ; they are all to be found in numbers in this county. To the vulgar eye these monuments are mere heaps of stones, but to the observant eye and trained intelligence all of them serve, each in its own way, to reveal to us the domestic, the social, the political, and the religious life of our own ancestors, in

the far distant past. Then there are implemental remains, that is, implements used in war, in hunting, and in domestic life, which are found in graves, in bogs, in rivers, or in old forts, all of which perfect and supplement our knowledge of those most interesting topics. Besides, there are artistic remains in sculpture, such as high crosses; in metal work, like croziers, bells, chalices, and reliquaries; in painting, if I may use the word, like frescoes, windows, illuminated books and manuscripts, which not only reveal to us the artistic skill of our ancestors, but also the costumes, the customs, the spirit, the deep religious feeling, and the characteristic religious observances of antiquity. We have, moreover, inscriptions in Ogham, in Latin, and in Gaelic, on pillars, on slabs, on crosses, and other sepulchral monuments, which often go far to supplement and confirm our information derived from historical sources.

You perceive then that these various human remains are the unwritten records of the past—I wish you to remember that expression—come down to us from pre-historic times; and they are often the only sure means we have of reproducing now the life of the people of this country in those remote days. And for those who can read them aright they are, so far as they go, more reliable sources of information than the written records, for the written records are often fabulous, and even in modern times are full of lies, but the unwritten records which men have left to us in the work of their own hands tell their own simple but most interesting story, without any possibility of fabrication. They are particularly valuable as oftentimes affording the means of testing and corroborating the statements made in our early annals and bardic tales, and we sometimes find that they confirm the substantial truth of those bardic tales in a very wonderful way. Sir W. Wilde has shown how existing monuments around Cong go to confirm the strange narrative of the battle of Moytura. The red pillar stone, still standing on the Hill of Rathcroghan, goes far to prove the historical existence of the Great King Dathi, whose remains are said to rest beneath it. And here, close to Galway, and near the round tower of Roscam, there is still standing a monumental pillar-stone without any

inscription, but ancient records say such a stone was erected by St. Hugh of Roscam over the grave of the great King Brian, the ancestor of all the kings of Connaught of the Hy Brian race, who take their name from him—that is the O'Conors, the O'Rourkes, and the O'Flahertys; thus the presence of the monument confirms the truth of the annalist. And surely it is interesting to know that the old Pagan warrior sleeps under that stone looking over the broad waters of Galway Bay for the last 1,400 years, whilst Celt, and Dane, and Norman, and Cromwellian, and Williamite, swept in many a fierce and bloody affray around his lonely grave. His sons were baptised by St. Patrick, but not himself. Still, we may surely say of the great old warrior what Tacitus has said of Argicola: "If there be any place for the shades of the brave, may his ashes rest in peace," there, beneath that standing stone, in the hearing of the stormy waters that break upon those western shores which he knew and loved so well.

But here someone may say, "How are we to acquire the trained mind and observant eye that will enable us to read those unwritten records of archæology in this County Galway?" Now, let me say at once that this is the outcome of the scientific study of the subject, and that it cannot be taught in a lecture nor learned in a day. Like all other sciences, to become a proficient, it requires careful and patient study, and that study will prove to be a most interesting, I may say even a fascinating intellectual exercise. This scientific study of archæology requires first a very careful observation of the facts—that is, of the remains themselves and all the circumstances that surround them. Then these facts must be classified and co-ordinated—that is, compared with other sets of facts of a similar character. In this way we are enabled to get sufficient data from which to deduce with reasonable certainty the industry, and the culture, and the civilisation of the area which has been examined. The area that we undertake to examine—that is, the County Galway—is of limited extent, and must be examined in the light of those discoveries which have been revealed throughout the whole area of Ireland, or, in other words, we cannot confine our attention to Galway alone. We must have some

knowledge of the general archæology of the country, and in the light of that knowledge we can examine with greater care the remains of human art, and industry, to be found within this county. For instance, a general knowledge of the subject of the remains of the ages of stone, of bronze, of iron, of the character of the weapons, the habitations, the food, the industries, the burial customs and religious rites of those various periods will be of great value in aiding our local investigations. Above all, we must bear in mind that the first duty of the archæologist is to preserve the existing monuments, which are the records of the past. If they can be preserved *in situ*—that is, in their natural home—so much the better. If not, then they should be transferred to some local or national museum for the instruction of future ages, for, if once mutilated or destroyed, they are, of course, lost for ever.

There is yet another thing we have undertaken to do—to collect and preserve by publication the folk-lore of Galway. Folk-lore I take to mean the living traditions of the unlettered people which have come down from sire to son, transmitted by the story-tellers who gather round the blazing hearth on the winter evenings and tell the ancient tales of war and love and piety, and superstition and fairy-lore, which they have heard from their fathers, generation after generation. In our time these story-tellers represent the ancient bard and chronicler who told similar tales high placed in hall, and the best and bravest of the land were assembled around the chieftain's board on the stated days of feasting and revelry. "Old times are changed, old manners gone." The chief and the bard and the warrior no more assemble around the same festive board to keep strong the spirit of their national life by feeding it on the glorious tales of the days of the heroic past. But it is not all gone yet. We have its only survival now, not in the castles of the great, but in the hearts of the people. And surely it were a pity that those stories of ancient days, so authentic in their own way, so brimful of national feeling in the best sense of the word, so pathetic, so wild, so strange, so fanciful, so moving—it were a pity there were no chronicler to record all their weird and simple beauty. Scholars of renown tell us that it was stories like these that

Homer gathered on the shores of the Ionian sea, and stringing them on a string of poetry wove out of them those immortal dreams of epic song that have ever since beguiled the listening world. Our ancient bards have sung the great themes of Ireland's heroic age with a noble simplicity and grandeur which falls little short of the sublimity of the Homeric poems themselves. We have still extant in the strong, sweet tongue of ancient Erin a collection of noble poems brimful of national life and feeling that cannot be excelled by the ancient literature of any other country in Western Europe. Few—alas, too few—can now appreciate those poems in the original, but let us hope that the noble tongue which so sweetly chants the loves and woes of Deirdre, the loyalty of Fergus, and the falseness of Conor, the queenly majesty of Maeve, and the heroic grandeur of Cuchullain—let us hope that it will never come to pass that those splendid Gaelic poems will be utterly neglected in the land that gave them birth.

In our own times, too, many distinguished poets have sung episodes from those ancient tales with much of the Celtic spirit that breathes in the lays of Ossian and his compeers. Most prominent amongst them is the honoured name of Ferguson, who in the *Lays of the Western Gael* has touched with a master's hand the long-silent strings of the harp of ancient Erin. He sings, it is true, in the tongue of another land, but the spirit that breathes in his poetry comes down to us from the heroic days of Erin's youth, just as in seasons of calm weather the western breeze, blowing far inland, carries with it an odour of brine from the billows of the Atlantic. There are living poets, too, whom I will not now name (some are here to-night) who have caught up the same mystic spirit of Gaelic romance from our ancient poets, and perhaps still more from the living traditions that yet linger round the fairy-haunted shores of our western sea. I have confident hope that a yet deeper study of those ancient tales, yet deeper draughts from the magic fountains of Erin's heroic past, will give spirit and inspiration to some gifted sons of the West, and move them to weave into fairy tales, in prose and verse, those great themes of olden days that will catch the ear of an artificial and worn-out world, and bring its votaries

here to freshen their spirit amid those wild scenes of ancient song, which the touch of genius will have glorified once more and peopled anew with the strange creations of the younger world, coming out to us like ghosts at eventide from the shadowy cloudland of the past. There is no reason why we should not have writers who will do for Ireland what Scott has done for Scotland, and it seems to me that the young muse of the West is even now gathering strength to expand her ample pinions in still loftier flights of poetry and romance. Let me add that I was greatly pleased to see that two distinguished writers are at present engaged in collecting the folk-lore of the County Galway. I shall be greatly disappointed if the volume will not turn out to be most attractive and inspiring.

To illustrate what I mean by folk-lore, and show its value both in history and literature, I will tell you two remarkable cases to the point, that came under my own observation on both occasions. I asked my dear friend, the late and greatly lamented Mr. Redington, if he knew where was Turlach Airt, the spot where King Art was killed in the great battle of Magh Mucrive, for I knew from O'Flaherty that it was near Kilcornan. He said he had never heard of it, but added, "Let us take a walk and make inquiries." We did so, but a shower coming on drove us to shelter in a house where there was no one but an old Irish-speaking woman. As she knew Irish I asked her if she had ever heard of Turlach Airt. "To be sure," she said, "I have. That was where the king was killed. Come out with me by-an-bye, and I will show you the very spot." And she did so, showing us the exact spot on a little hillock, where the King, who had dismounted to quench his thirst, was slain just as he had regained his seat. His head and shoulder fell off, but the body remained in the saddle, and was carried by the affrighted horse nearly a mile towards Kilcornan House, until it fell at a spot called, from the circumstance, Leath Airt—the half of Art. It was long marked by a great stone, as Mr. Redington then remembered. In making some new road, the stone was carried off. Here was an old woman who had never opened a book in her life giving us most interesting information from

her store of folk-lore, which was wholly unknown to the learned and cultured owner of the soil. What a pity such knowledge should be lost and such interesting sites should be wholly forgotten.

On another occasion I was in the remote Island of Inisglora, off the coast of the Mullet—a remarkably wild and lonely spot. I had read the fate of the Children of Lir—a most beautiful and pathetic story—and you know that when that fated 900 years of enchantment were over they were to be disenchanted by the sound of the Saint's bell, and after baptism were to fly to Heaven. There was a boy with us—an Irish-speaking youth—and I asked him if he had ever heard of the story of the enchanted swans that used to fly from Iniskea to Inisglora and all round Mullet. "Yes," he said, "and you are standing on the spot where they are buried. The Saint was saying Mass there, and they stood here and kept quietly flapping their wings until his bell began to ring. Then at that moment they recovered their ancient form, and when Mass was over the Saint baptised them yonder in the Holy Well, and they died and he buried them beside his chapel under the flag on which you are standing." Here was the folk-lore floating down the stream of time and fixing the very spot where the disenchanted swans were buried.

But you may ask me—"Of what use is this archaeology and why should we trouble ourselves over those relics of a far distant and barbarous past?" Well, as to its utility, these studies will not put money in your purse, and they are not designed to minister in any way to your sensual enjoyment; but there are higher and nobler aims in life than to make money or gratify the senses. Not on bread alone does man live; he has an intellectual and moral nature higher than the brutes. He has aspirations and yearnings that mere sensuality can never gratify, nor ever wholly stifle. Studies like these exercise an elevating and refining influence on man's intellectual and moral nature. They enlarge the sphere of his knowledge, they open to his gaze the boundless vistas of distant ages, and re-people for him the shadowy regions of the past:—

"We look before and after,
And pine for what is not."

It is the nature of man. We seek to restore the buried ages and to forecast what will take place in the near and the distant future, and we oftentimes shape our conduct in the present, consciously or unconsciously, by our knowledge of the past, and by our hopes and fears for the future. Neither can we be indifferent to the ages and the men that are gone, especially in our own country, for we are the outcome of the past. The present age and generation here amongst ourselves are the growth of the generations that are gone. From them we have our life, our language, our civilisation, our physical and moral nature, our hopes and fears, our joys, and our sorrows. We cannot dis sever ourselves from our ancestors, and whether they were barbarous or not we ought not to disown them. Then what is barbarism, and what is culture? Were the Hebrew shepherds in the time of the Patriarchs barbarous? Were the Romans under Cincinnatus? were the Gauls that fought against Cæsar? were they not all better and nobler men than the corrupt races that succeeded them, and are said to be civilised? It is men of simple habits and robust nature whom you call barbarous—self-denying, truthful, brave—that have built up the great Empires of the world, which, under their corrupt and “civilised” descendants gradually decay, and finally fall to pieces. But, civilised or barbarous, you cannot dissociate yourselves from your ancestors in the past any more than the great oak can dissociate itself from the sapling that produced it. We are the growth of the past, we have its blood in our veins, we have its spirit in our hearts, we have its vigour in our limbs, we have its thoughts in our brain; and I cannot think much of the man who, pretending to be a scholar, will spend the best years of his youth in studying the literature and antiquities of Greece and Rome, or of France, or England, or Germany, but who will live and die ignorant of and indifferent to the ancient literature and the ancient civilisation of his own mother land. To redeem us from such a reproach this society has been founded.

CATHOLIC ASPECTS OF TENNYSON'S POETRY.

AMONGST the writings of the great African apologist is a short treatise which he calls *The Testimony of the Soul*, wherein he endeavours to prove that the soul is naturally Christian—*anima naturaliter Christiana*. With that invincible logic, which, though it could not save himself from error, brought millions to the Church, he shows that the human soul, when unschooled in the discipline of error, by its feelings, tendencies and aspirations, bears testimony to the truth of the fundamental dogmas of Christianity. In a somewhat similar sense, we think, it may be shown that, at least among Christians, the poet's soul is naturally Catholic; that is to say, it frequently bears unwilling and sometimes unconscious testimony to the truth and beauty of the doctrines, rites, and practices of the Catholic Church. But as this statement is by no means self-evident, we shall take the liberty of developing it at some length.

Edgar Allen Poe, one of the most gifted of the Lost Sons of Genius, tells us that "Beauty is the sole legitimate province of the poem," and he adds, "that pleasure which is the most intense, the most elevating, and the most pure, is found in the contemplation of the Beautiful." This last statement in its highest sense, can hardly be questioned, at least by those who believe, as all Catholics do, that the essential happiness of heaven consists in the unveiled contemplation of the Beauty of the Divine Essence. So also in created things it is only natural that the highest and purest pleasure should be found in the contemplation of those forms of Beauty which, after all, are only the dim reflection of the Uncreated Beauty of God. According to this theory, Truth is the gratification of the intellect, Virtue the perfection of the will, Passion the excitement of the heart; but the soul contemplates, and is elevated and pleased by the contemplation of the Beautiful; and this pleasurable excitement is what pleases in genuine poetry. This doctrine is not very abstruse, and

appears to us substantially correct ; but it needs some explanation. By the " Soul " we presume the writer means man's emotional nature ; then his theory is not different, except in words, from that of a recent critic who maintains that the function of art, especially poetic art, is " to quicken our life into a higher consciousness through the feelings." The poet's soul is not only keenly perceptive, but vividly emotional ; in him thought and feeling are indissolubly blended " like two streams of incense free from one censer," or like the solidity and grace of some grand old Gothic cathedral which are separable in the abstract, but cannot be disjoined in the concrete fact. " Beauty," too, must be understood in a wide, substantive sense ; for the Good, and the True, and the Human are also beautiful, and as such belong to that fair and bright domain which is the region of the poet's birth :

" The poet in a golden clime was born,
 With golden stars above ;
 Dower'd with the hate of hate, the scorn of scorn,
 The love of love.
 He saw through life and death, through good and ill,
 He saw through his own soul.
 The marvel of the everlasting will,
 An open scroll,
 Before him lay—"

Understood in this sense, the Beautiful is the sole legitimate province of the poem, but it is mental, or ideal beauty, beauty of thought expressed in melodious language. Art in all its various forms deals with the Beautiful. It is the sculptor's purpose to produce shapes of beauty in bronze or marble ; the painter does the same in colours ; the musician by sounds ; the poet in measured language. Thus the purpose of all art is " to quicken our life into a higher consciousness," the means employed is the contemplation of the Beautiful, the artists only differ in the material *ex qua* which is peculiar to each. Thought and its organ, language, is the subtlest and most plastic material from which the poet moulds his forms of enduring beauty, first conceived in his own mind, and then reproduced, so that we can perceive his perception. Hence, the Greeks, who seldom misnamed anything, called this artist the " poet " *par excellence*, that is, the " creator," and exactly in proportion to his power of creation or mental vision is the

perfection of his poetry. Metre and rhyme are mere accidentals, adding, indeed, to the finish and mental pleasure, but not essential to genuine poetry. Hence, Sir Philip Sydney's *Arcadia* and Fenélon's *Télémaque* have always been regarded as prose poems of great beauty, nor is there anything like metre in Walt Whitman's democratic effusions. But the poet must be a *Seer*; in the exercise of his art he roams through the universe searching for the beautiful; and when he finds it, he endeavours, according to the measure of his gift, to reproduce it. And not alone in the various aspects of external nature, in the lights of heaven, the changeful sea, the voices of the streams, the songs of the birds, and the rich vesture of summer woods, does the poet find fitting themes for lofty flights of imagination—these are only as the shadow to the substance in comparison with the fairer and more substantial beings of the moral universe, and it requires a far keener vision and diviner gift to discover and reproduce them. Here, especially, the poet must be “dowered with the hate of hate, the scorn of scorn, the love of love;” he must fathom the inmost depths of the human soul, and be able to throw light on the hidden things of darkness. In the drama he depicts the great actions of kings and heroes, weaving with cross purposes the fateful web of human woe; on the lyre he strikes the chords of individual passion; but it is in the lofty epic he must put forth his highest strength, when some all-engrossing theme of momentous issues is developed, brimful of interest to generations and kingdoms yet unborn.

Thus, the poet scans the whole moral and material universe; he even dares, in what is sometimes an impious gaze, to lift his eyes to the Infinite, and fathom the mysteries of the Divine Economy. He sees, or fancies he sees, “the marvel of the everlasting will an open scroll before him lie.” He cannot well do without some form of religion; if he has not that revealed by God, he will make one to suit his own purposes, a strange admixture of truth and error, interwoven primarily with a view to artistic effect, in which the bright rays will gleam through palpable darkness. He will put up with such transparent shams as the “Religion of Culture,” or of Humanity, or some other entity, which will best suit his

purposes. But when all the tracts of earth and heaven sweep before his inward eye, there is one thing of light and beauty which must cross his field of vision. The City on the Mountain cannot quite be hidden. If the Catholic Church has "imperious dogma," she has also "tender humanities;" and if the imperious dogma is repulsive to the pride of intellect, the fair humanities will attract the sympathies of the artistic soul. He will not, indeed, have the full, clear vision of a believer; the lines of light will be lost or deflected in their passage through the turbid medium of ignorance or prejudice; but he will, at least, get isolated glimpses, though he cannot realise the perfect harmony of her lineaments and the fulness of her radiant beauty. Somewhat like the Chaldean Seers of old, who with naked eye mapped out in their own bright skies the courses of the larger planets, the far darting glance of genius may perceive many things hidden from the vulgar gaze, but it needs the telescopic power of faith to reveal with precision the marvellous harmony of the spiritual world. Yet the genuine poet, even with the light of reason alone, will see many things to admire in the Church—the suitability of her doctrines to the wants of human nature, the majesty of her ritual, the beauty of that holiness which clings to her like a garment; and seeing he must sing, for it is his nature. As the trees burst into bloom when the quickening spring breathes upon them, the poet will burst into song when brought face to face with things of beauty.

We might illustrate our meaning by quotations from Shakspeare, from the puritanic Milton, and the scoffing Byron, but we shall content ourselves with producing a few passages from Tennyson in support of our doctrine. In him, indeed, we ought to distinguish two distinct phases of the poetic spirit—we had almost said two distinct poets. We have little sympathy with Tennyson, as the Teacher of the Present, or the Prophet of the Future. We cannot, as he seems to do, regard the mind of man as either self-sustaining or self-controlling without aid from above. The sorely-tempted soul can surely find better reasons against self-destruction than are put forward in the *Two Voices*; indeed, in that colloquy the still small voice, that urges annihilation as a

refuge from the withering palsy, seems to have the best of the argument. All the poet's mind seems clouded with dark doubts about the future; he has no certain hope of an immortal life beyond the grave; he does not even urge Plato's argument that the soldier must not leave his post without the general's order. If selfish considerations of a purely natural order were the best reasons against the "still small voice," better than palsy or dishonour to many minds would be Cato's *nobile letum*.

Neither can we admit that it is man's highest destiny in the future, to

" Rift the hills, and roll the waters, flash the lightnings, weigh the sun—"

Or that his loftiest aspirations should be to

" See the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Till the war-drum throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were
furled,

In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world."

All this is excellent in its way, but it must not be the be-all and end-all of human existence. Material progress is good, but we cannot make it our god; "the dread anatomy of culture," as George Eliot calls it, would stifle every spiritual aspiration, and carries with it into the bright regions of poetic fancy the odours of the dissecting-room. It may be the highest purpose of our lives in the estimation of this nineteenth century civilization, but, most assuredly, material and scientific progress is not inculcated in the Sermon on the Mount, as the *summum bonum* of human existence. Tennyson, indeed, inculcates in his poetry reverence for Law, Order, Duty, and Obedience; the perfection of his ideal hero consists in "self-knowledge, self-reverence, self-control." Arthur the blameless king, "reverences his conscience as his king," and this supremacy of conscience, sometimes painful but always salutary, is as a shield to arm a man against himself. But the poet's Law is without a sanction, his Order has no standard of perfection, and there can be no Duty but mere expediency when there is no Supreme Will to impose an obligation. He perceives, indeed, the exquisite symmetry of the bridge of

social perfection, but he forgets the foundations on which it reposes, and the keystone which gives it strength.

Not so, however, in the cycle of Arthurian poems ; there Tennyson shows himself a far different, and, we think, much superior artist, because he has before him a loftier ideal. We suppose the poet has no Catholic sympathies, but he is too faithful to the instincts of his art not to perceive the grandeur and moral beauty of those old Catholic times, and too honest not to reproduce them faithfully. Here he is the poet of a romantic past in which the spirit of religious chivalry solders that goodly fellowship of famous knights, inspiring them with lofty purpose and unselfish daring. Not, indeed, unmoved by passion, or unstained by crime, are all the members of Arthur's court, but in this they are only the mirror of the mighty world, in which the tares and wheat will always grow together ; and even Launcelot and the guilty queen know how to wash away the soilure of their souls in the fountains of true repentance.

But in Arthur himself and the maiden knight, Sir Galahad, the poet has created the fairest ideals of romantic chivalry, and endowed them with that spiritual vitality, which it is the gift of the Catholic Church alone to breathe into living souls. One will search in vain the records of Protestant kings for any monarch like Arthur, but the prototype may be found in Edward, the Confessor-king, or still better in St. Louis of France, the brave, the chaste, the chivalrous, a hero who led a blameless life like Arthur, and died even a nobler death. The institution of the military orders has been generally misunderstood and misrepresented, but Tennyson has caught up the spirit that animated the Church, and expresses her ideas and her purpose in glowing language. That a soldier of the Cross should be chaste as well as brave, that he should give the undivided service of his heart and sword to the King whose standard he followed, was the idea of the Church. Like St. Paul, she holds that marriage divides the mind ; " for the unmarried man is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God, but he that is with a wife is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife, and *he is divided*." ¹ This undivided

¹ *Cor.* 7, 32.

service the Church demands from her priests, from her monks and nuns, even from her soldiers, and in Sir Galahad we have her ideal of a militant knight exactly realised :—

“ My good blade carves the casques of men,
My tough lance thrusteth sure,
My strength is as the strength of ten,
Because my heart is pure.”

Other knights may seek to win the fickle favour of the Queen of the Tournament :—

“ But all my heart is drawn above,
My knees are bowed in crypt and shrine ;
I never felt the kiss of love,
Nor lady's hand in mine ;
More bounteous aspects on me beam,
Me mightier transports move and thrill,
So keep I fair through faith and prayer
A virgin heart in work and will.”

We fear there is now-a-days some inconsistency between the ideas of soldier and saint, and that martial prowess is seldom associated with purity of heart. We have no large-souled heroes of the ancient type, like the Godfreys, and Bayards, and La Valettes, those lustrous stars shining in the firmament of the “ dark ages ” with a glory that cannot die. With better reason than even old Caxton we may ask, “ O ye knyghtes of England, where is the custome and usage of noble chyvalry that was used in those days ? what do ye now but go to the baynes and play at dyse ? And some not well advysed use not honest and good rule again alle ordre of knyghthode ; leve this, leve it, and rede the noble volumes of Saant graal, of lancelot, of galaad, of trystam, of perseforest, of percyual, of gawayn, and many more. There shall ye see manhode, curtesye, and gentylness.”

Tennyson has indeed left us a noble volume of the Holy Grail, in which he shows us manhood, courtesy, gentleness and faith—qualities some of which at least are fast dying out amongst the knights of England and of Europe too. The healing virtue of the Holy Cup, its miraculous vision hidden from an unbelieving world, and vouchsafed only to pure and holy souls, the Quest vainly undertaken by the sensual and

frivolous, but successfully accomplished by the "just and faithful knight of God," are all the poetic expression of Catholic doctrines. The holy nun first beholds the Cup of healing who

"—— prayed and fasted, till the sun
Shone, and the wind blew thro' her, and I thought
She might have risen and floated when I saw her."

And her eyes seemed to the beholders

"Beyond my knowing of them, beautiful,
Beyond all knowing of them, beautiful,
Beautiful in the light of holiness."

This pale nun, unstained by any sin, devoted to the silent life of prayer, ardently longing for the cleansing of the wicked world, tells her brother, Percivale, how she saw the Holy Grail :

"For waked at dead of night, I heard a sound
As of a silver horn from o'er the hills
Blown, ... and then
Streamed through my cell a cold and silver beam,
And down the long beam stole the Holy Grail,
Rose-red with beatings in it, as if alive,
Till all the white walls of my cell were dyed
With rosy colours leaping on the wall."

And one there was amongst the knights of Arthur, Sir Galahad, "who ever moved amongst them in white armour ;" to him she told her vision, and when he heard the wondrous tale, his eyes became, like her own, filled with spiritual light.

"And she, the wan sweet maiden, shore away
Clean from her forehead all the wealth of hair,
Which made a silken network for her feet."

And out of this she platted him a strong sword-belt, with the Holy Grail inwrought in crimson colours. Thus armed in faith and purity, he went forth on the quest at her bidding, steadfast of purpose and patient of toil, nor ceased he till God crowned him king "far in the spiritual city." And all Arthur's knights, bound by solemn vow, set forth on this quest a twelvemonth and a day ; but their hearts were not clean and their motives were not holy, so they were led away by wandering fires, and all their toilsome searching was in vain.

Only Sir Percivale the Pure, obtained a passing glimpse of the Holy Cup, and then returning, left the court and tournament.

“ And passed into the silent life of prayer,
Praise, fast, and alms, and leaving for the cowl
The helmet in an abbey far away
From Camelot, there and not long after died.”

It will be seen from these extracts not only that the Holy Grail gives spiritual life to the worthy communicants, but that the poet recognises in prayer, and fasting, and alms, a cleansing efficacy which is quite new to the Protestant mind.

St. Paul orders women to veil their heads in the Church “ propter angelos,” and some commentators understand the reference to be to the invisible angels who surround the altar in adoration when Christ comes down from heaven at the moment of consecration. The maiden knight “ saw the fiery face as of a child that smote itself into the Bread,” not unattended, however, for, as it is elsewhere expressed,

“ A gentle sound ! an awful light !
Three angels bear the Holy Grail,
With folded feet, in stoles of white,
On sleeping wings they sail.”

Not alone in this noble poem but frequently elsewhere, Tennyson gives eloquent expression to Catholic ideas. The queendom of the Blessed Virgin over angels and men, her intercessory power, and, above all, her compassionate sympathy for sinful or sorrow-laden souls, are frequently referred to. The filial love and confidence of the Catholic heart is very truthfully portrayed in *Mariana in the South*. The desolate maiden appeals to her “ sweet mother ” in heaven with all the endearing epithets familiar to the Irish heart. “ Ave Maria, made she moan,” “ before Our Lady murmured she,” “ Mother, give me grace to help me of my weary load.” Perhaps the Commissioners of National Education would not object to insert this beautiful poem in their books instead of *Mariana in the Moated Grange*, to which it is far superior in melody and tenderness.

According to the Catholic idea the Church is one great family embracing all holy souls in heaven, on earth, and in

purgatory, with Jesus Christ as their Living Head diffusing vital energy through all the members, and making of all the Church one complete and perfectly developed organism. There is, consequently, an intimate union between all the members of this mystic body, partially maintained by faith and hope, but perfected by charity. And there is not only union but communion, from which necessarily results in a living body inter-communication, maintained by sympathy, charity, and fellowship in good works. “*Si quid patitur unum membrum compatiuntur omnia membra ; sive gloriatur unum membrum congaudent omnia membra.*” Unprotestant, indeed, is this theory, but very natural, or rather very supernatural, and very beautiful, as the poet partially expresses it in the words of the dying Arthur to Sir Bedivere,

“ But thou,
If thou shouldst never see my face again,
Pray for my soul. More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of. Wherefore, let thy voice
Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain
If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friend ?
For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.”

Neither is the poet insensible to the majesty and beauty of Catholic worship. Not in a conventicle, with a wooden table for altar, and bare white walls like a workhouse, can God be most and fittingly worshipped. “*Snowy altar-cloths,*” “*tapers burning fair,*” “*silver vessels sparkling clean,*” the music of shrill sounding bells, the organ’s rolling harmony, censers swinging incense-clouds to heaven, make the appropriate ritual for the gorgeous shrines of the poet’s imagination. Indeed, that spirit of scepticism and negation, which would substitute individual opinion for the certainty of Catholic faith, has proved utterly destructive, not only of poetry, but of all the other fine arts. The sceptic’s “hollow smile” and the sophist’s “frozen sneer” are deadly to the bloom of poetry, nor does Tennyson disdain to sprinkle “holy water” in order to hedge in the sanctuary of the poet’s mind from their blighting influence. In this respect he proves himself true

to Catholic and artistic instincts, for the Church makes poetry and the fine arts her handmaidens in the worship of God. If He is entitled to man's homage and service at all, He is entitled to the loftiest efforts of his genius. Hence it is the Church uses poetry and music in her services ; the niches of her temples are filled with the sculptor's noblest works ; in her storied windows she tells simple souls the history of holy lives, or melts them into penitential sorrow by holding up before their eyes the memorials of our Saviour's passion. She avails herself of every aid to raise men's thoughts from earth to heaven, and all the more willingly because these forms of holiness and beauty pre-eminently become the House of God, who is the Author of all holiness and of all beauty. Nor does she fear that these things will in aught divert the simplest minds from the Creator to the creature ; the process is quite the reverse. The same feelings which make a child kiss the mother's picture, prompt a Christian to kiss the sacred symbol of man's redemption, and bow the knee before the sculptured saint. And here, again, the poet's soul, naturally Catholic, testifies in our favour. When the people are represented as crowding round St. Simeon Stylites, and kneeling at the foot of his penitential pillar, at first in his humility he dissuades them :—

“ Good people, you do ill to kneel me ;
What is it I can have done to merit this ? ”

But correcting himself a moment after he adds—

“ Yet do not rise ; for you may look on me,
And in your looking you may kneel to God.”

Exactly. Catholics praying to saints for their intercession, or kneeling before the images of Christ and his saints, look on these holy memorials, and “ in their looking kneel to God,” and to Him alone, as the Author of grace and mercy. Indeed, this beautiful poem on St. Simeon Stylites is far from being penned in the scoffing spirit of those who cannot understand the things of the Spirit of God. With wonderful fidelity the poet perceives the true significance of that extraordinary life of superhuman austerity, and sounds the depth of

self-abasement which prompted all his acts. Even when purified by thrice ten years of penance he still considered himself—

“ From scalp to sole, one slough and crust of sin,
Unfit for earth, unfit for heaven, scarce meet
For troops of devils—”

Tennyson's wide-eyed vision of the majesty and power of the Church is well exhibited in the language of Cardinal Pole in “ Queen Mary.” A friend, who has a keen appreciation of Tennyson's poetry, brought to our notice the following beautiful passage :—

“ When did our Rome tremble ?
The Church on Peter's rock ? Never ! I have seen
A pine in Italy that cast its shadow
Athwart a cataract ; firm stood the pine ;
The cataract shook the shadow. To my mind
The cataract typed the headlong plunge and fall
Of heresy to the pit ; the pine was Rome.
You see, my Lords,
It was the shadow of the Church that trembled.”

These be tropes, as Gardiner said, but tropes that gracefully clothe the naked truth of the Church's enduring power and unchanging doctrine. To men who rapidly glide down the stream she may seem to tremble or to change, but it is only her shadow flickering on the water which they see. Because the Church does not go down with them in the wild career of headlong plunges, which they call progress, she is, forsooth, behind the age and unsuited to the times. But the ages roll on to the ocean of infinitude, and the Church remains firmly rooted in the solid rock. Not, indeed, without growth and development, for the mustard-tree yearly throws out new branches and affords a wider shelter to the birds of heaven ; but its growth is from within, the germ of every new branch and blossom was in the seedling when first cast into the soil.

On the whole, we must allow that Tennyson has a large and appreciative sympathy for “ the tender humanities of the Catholic Church,” and we must do him the justice to say that prejudice has not dimmed the brightness of his vision, nor scepticism chilled the warmth of his poetic emotions.

THE WRITINGS OF CARDINAL CULLEN.¹

THESE three volumes, which contain the pastoral Letters and other Writings of his Eminence the late Archbishop of Dublin, form the most valuable contribution of the present century to the Ecclesiastical history of Ireland. They cover a period of nearly thirty years, from February, 1850, to October, 1878, and it is not too much to say that during that most important period of Irish history, the late Cardinal was not only the head of the Catholic Church in Ireland, but also the most influential and energetic champion of its interests. He guided its policy, he shaped its destiny, he moulded its discipline. It is his voice that speaks at the Synod of Thurles in 1850, and at Maynooth in 1875. He had a purpose which he steadily pursued, and a mission which he almost completely accomplished. He spoke with no uncertain voice on all the great questions affecting Catholic interests, and no government could ignore his influence. His history is the history of the Irish Church during his episcopate, and these volumes furnish ample materials for understanding both. The Editor, as might be expected, has done his work well; but we venture to think it would add much to the interest of these volumes, if Dr. Moran had given us a brief memoir of his illustrious Uncle. It would serve to fix the reader's attention on the noteworthy events to which the various documents refer, and render them more intelligible to the ordinary reader by marking their connection and mutual dependence. Nor would such a memoir lessen the interest with which a fuller life with appropriate extracts from these letters would be read by all intelligent Irishmen. No doubt such a life will shortly make its appearance, and will be eagerly read by very many persons who would be unwilling to undertake the perusal of these three bulky volumes.

¹ *The Pastoral Letters and other Writings of Cardinal Cullen, Archbishop of Dublin.* Edited by the Bishop of Ossory. Dublin: Browne & Nolan, 1882.

The first document in the collection is the Pastoral Letter to the clergy of Armagh, addressed from Rome by Dr. Cullen on the 24th of February, 1850—the day of his consecration as Archbishop and Primate of all Ireland. In this, his first address, we naturally seek the keynote of the new Prelate's character and policy, and we can easily find it. Every page breathes the spirit of a charity as intense as that of St. Paul, and we believe that most people would agree that charity in its widest sense was the late Cardinal's most characteristic virtue. He puts forward, too, the principles that were to guide his future conduct, and the foes whom he meant to attack. As faith is the root of all spiritual life, he signals out the open or covert opponents of the Catholic faith as the most dangerous enemies of the Church. Hence he cautions the clergy from the very beginning against, "the many systems of education in which snares are laid for unsuspecting youth." He warns them to beware of those "who pretending to promote the interests of society preach up sedition and licentiousness under the sacred name of liberty." He denounces proselytism in exceedingly vigorous language, as "a base and degrading traffic" in immortal souls; and implores the clergy to stop "the torrent of bad books by which society is inundated, or if they cannot remove the poison to try and procure an effective antidote by giving those under their charge a sound religious education."

With these four enemies the late Cardinal was in perpetual conflict, he never for a moment forgot them, in all his public utterances the reader will almost invariably find reference to some one or the other of these "wolves" who prey upon the flock of Christ; and most certainly he did much to scare them away. Proselytism, secret societies, mixed education, and bad books, were for him a hydra begotten of Satan, having one body and four heads. It was well to strike down the monster if possible; if not, at least to try and smite the head that was nearest and greediest.

In this same Pastoral we can note the cardinal virtues of the Archbishop's sacerdotal character—an intense devotion and unswerving fidelity to the Roman Pontiff, which we, like his enemies, may call Ultramontanism—a tender love

for the Blessed Virgin Mary, and a great zeal for the renovation and maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline. It will be seen that in every one of his public acts, the Cardinal gives ample evidence of his love for these three virtues, which in him were cemented by a most unselfish charity.

The next important pronouncement was the Synodical Address of the National Council of Thurles, dated September 9th, 1850. If this document was not actually written by Dr. Cullen, it certainly expresses his views. He was, as he himself tells us, sent from Rome to procure the condemnation of the newly-established Queen's Colleges, and found a Catholic University after the model of Louvain. He presided in the National Synod held mainly for this purpose; and hence we find special prominence given to the great question of Catholic Education. The new governmental system is described as "fraught with grievous and intrinsic dangers" to the faith and morals of Catholics, and Bishops and Priests are forbidden to take any part in carrying it into effect. At the same time the people are solemnly cautioned against those condemned versions of the Scriptures, which were in the hands of the proselytisers, and also against all those publications "in which loyalty is treated as a crime, a spirit of sedition is insinuated, and efforts are made to induce the people to make common cause with the apostles of sedition and infidelity in other countries." These words were certainly not designed to convey any censure of the Tenant League, which had been established in the previous month of August; but were rather directed against the leaders of the secret societies, who in spite of the abortive attempt at rebellion two years previous, still continued to excite the people to sedition and bloodshed, and were undoubtedly in league with the revolutionary propaganda of the French capital. Doctor Cullen declared, at a later date, that at this period his own diocese of Armagh was infected with these secret societies, and that they were only eradicated by the zealous efforts of the Vincentian Fathers during their missions, especially in Dundalk and Crossmaglen.

The country was just then in a very excited state. "Clearances" of the wretched tenantry, who had survived

the famine, were taking place in many counties over wide areas. Hence, although the prelates caution the people against the agents of sedition, they denounced in eloquent and forcible terms the horrible cruelties of the ruthless exterminators, "which have no parallel except in the atrocities of savage life."

The disciplinary enactments of this famous Synod have done much, as everyone knows, to infuse that vigorous and fruitful spiritual life into all classes of the Catholic community, which has ever since manifested its presence in multifarious works of charity and religion.

Meanwhile Dr. Cullen lost no time in carrying out the other portion of his scheme—the establishment of a Catholic University. A committee of prelates had been appointed by the Synod of Thurles, consisting of the four Archbishops, and four Suffragans—one from each province. This committee issued an address to the people of Ireland in September, 1850, on the subject of the new University: and this address was supplemented in November by a Pastoral Letter from Dr. Cullen to the clergy of Armagh on Catholic Education. This document is of considerable importance, because it contains an elaborate exposition of Dr. Cullen's views on Catholic Education, from which he never afterwards swerved. At a later date, in February, 1869, we find a still more extended exposition of the same principles given before the Royal Commission on Primary Education; but a careful study of both documents will show that Dr. Cullen still adhered to his original views on all points. These views were enunciated with admirable clearness and force before the Royal Commission, and will well repay careful perusal.

He declares that all "sincere and enlightened Christians are agreed that religious education is necessary, that without it no man can know what to believe, or what to do, and that both faith and works are necessary for salvation." The greatest writers, philosophers, and statesmen of every party and sect, whom he quotes at length, all admit that religion is an essential part of everything worthy of the name of education. But to have a religious education, "the teacher should be religious, the atmosphere of the school should be

religious, every hour of the day religion should be inhaled," in order to maintain the moral growth of the rising generation at all stages of their education—primary, intermediate, and university.

From the necessity of religious education, the Cardinal adds, follows the right of the Church to direct and control it, a right which she has not received from man, but from God, and which she can never consent to forego.

The first objection of the Chairman of the Commission was that this doctrine was impracticable in a country like Ireland ; but Dr. Cullen pointed out that if it was practicable in England, it could not fairly be deemed impracticable in Ireland, and he formulated a scheme which he showed was quite feasible and at the same time denominational.

A more serious difficulty was urged when a member of the Committee observed that Dr. Murray had sanctioned what he, Cardinal Cullen, condemned. "No," answered his Eminence, "Dr. Murray did not *sanction* the National School system ; he only tolerated it as an experiment, and he took a place on the Board to observe how it worked. He thought it might succeed, but in this he was mistaken, the mixed system as such could never succeed. Whenever the clergy put forward their views on the education question, they always required the denominational system." The Cardinal was particularly emphatic in showing that Dr. Whately intended and believed that the system would undermine by slow degrees "the vast fabric of the Romish Church" in Ireland, and he roundly accuses him of "treacherous" conduct in his capacity as Commissioner. When asked to explain how Dr. Whately's conduct could be regarded as "treacherous," his reply is crushing. "Dr. Whately," he says, "repeatedly asserted in the official reports signed by his hand, that all proselytism was strictly prohibited, but declared in private to his friends that the system was a vast engine of proselytism undermining the faith of Catholics, and he intended it to be such." Such conduct was hardly fair ; it was *treacherous* ; and few will gainsay the statement from an impartial point of view.

But was not opposition to the National system an outcome

of that Ultramontaniam which had its expression in the Synod of Thurles, and in Ireland dated from the Cardinal's own appointment to the See of Armagh without the voting of the clergy—observed one of the Commissioners. However, his Eminence met this difficulty too. Ultramontaniam, he said, is nothing except a term of opprobrium as used in the English newspapers. As applied to Irishmen in so far as it means anything, it signifies devotion to the Supreme Pontiff, that is devotion to the Catholic Church, and therefore every true Catholic is an Ultramontane, and in that sense of the word the Irish Catholics, or nearly all of them, are Ultramontanes.

As regards his own elevation to the See of Armagh and his subsequent translation to Dublin, both, he added, were in strict accordance with canon law. The Pope had originally the right of nominating to all the Irish Sees. About 1830 he granted to the Parish Priests the right of selecting three names, but that rescript reserved to the Pope the right of nominating whenever he thought proper. He did think proper in the case of Armagh to exercise his right, and acted accordingly ; but he followed the recommendation of the clergy in translating Dr. Cullen to Dublin.

As regards the books used by the Board, the Cardinal observed that they were objectionable, because most of them were composed by Protestants, especially by Dr. Whately and the Rev. Mr. Carlisle. About their literary merits, his Eminence made the pregnant observation, "that if all the books printed by the National Board were sent to the middle of the Atlantic and cast out into the ocean, Ireland and her literature would suffer no great loss." That is not to be wondered at, seeing that in the Fifth Book of Lessons, in 124 pages of history, the first mention of Ireland is to the effect that in the twelfth century "Henry II. received the submission of the Irish kings." The second fact, mentioned under the date 1800, is "the Union of Great Britain and Ireland." The Cardinal's evidence before this Commission covers nearly 300 pages of the second volume, and certainly deserves careful study. There can be no doubt, too, that his able and skilful exposure of the defects of the National system

did much to induce the Commissioners to remove the principal causes of complaint. It is to him, and to others who so vigilantly watched the working of the National system, that we owe its practically denominational character in many parts of Ireland. So far from becoming, as Dr. Whately anticipated, a proselytising agency, it has become just the reverse ; proselytism has been successful to any appreciable extent only in those places where the National schools did not exist.

In the case of Intermediate Education, the efforts of the late Cardinal to secure the denominational system were crowned with complete success. In spite of the parsimony of the Government the system is working well, and seems to give satisfaction to all parties.

In the matter of University Education, however, the denominational system has hitherto met with greater opposition and achieved a more dubious success.

The Queen's Colleges were founded in 1845, and at first received considerable support from influential quarters, both clerical and lay. Even the hierarchy itself was divided ; and, after some discussion, it was decided to refer the question to Rome. After a mature discussion during the summer of 1847, the Congregation of the Propaganda pronounced, in a rather hesitating way, against the new institution—*“ Religioni institutionem hujusmodi detrimento existere arbitratur.”*

Meantime great efforts were made to avert anything like a formal condemnation of the new Colleges, whereupon Dr. M'Hale and several other Prelates went to Rome in 1848, just before the Revolution broke out, and their representations determined the new Pope, Pius IX., to condemn the Colleges at the earliest opportunity. So, when the revolutionary storm had blown over, and Pius had returned to his capital in 1850, instructions were given to the new Archbishop of Armagh to convene the Synod of Thurles, and have the Colleges condemned. This was accordingly done ; but lest Catholics should complain that there was no place of higher education for them, it was resolved to found a new University in Dublin after the model of Louvain.

From this period, until the time of his death, there was no other project which the late Cardinal had more at heart, and to which he referred oftener in all his public addresses. The Committee appointed by the Synod of Thurles, of which he was the head, at once took vigorous measures to ensure success. A strong appeal was made to the country; large sums of money were collected. England, America, and even France, were invited to give sympathy and support to the new movement. Public addresses were delivered, large subscriptions flowed in, remonstrances were made to the Government on the gross injustice to which Irish Catholics were subjected; and of all these sustained efforts the Cardinal was the life and soul.

Almost from the beginning, however, difficulties arose. There was no other Irish Prelate who more vigorously opposed the Queen's Colleges than Dr. M'Hale, yet so early as 1854, he began to hold aloof from the Catholic University scheme. Canon Ulick Bourke, in his "Life of Dr. M'Hale," declares, on the authority of the Archbishop himself, his reasons for so doing. In his opinion the new University should be a national institution, the Board of Bishops should have a voice in the nomination of its professors, it should "be 'universal' under a two-fold form—first, in its directive administration, and next, in its objective extension." The last expression is somewhat vague; but we suppose it means that the Catholic University, like the College of Maynooth, should be national in its government, its professoriate, and its students. Dr. Cullen, it is added, could not accept this view. He claimed to have received from the Pope the supreme government of the new University. "The advice of Dr. M'Hale was not heeded; nay," the writer adds, "it was treated with complete disregard."

If, indeed, the Catholic University was not meant to be a national institution in every sense indicated above, many persons will think it deserved failure; but as far as we can form an opinion from the materials in these volumes, there is nothing to show that Dr. Cullen ever meant it to be anything but a truly national institution. He would of course naturally be the Chancellor of a University within his

archdiocese : but everything points to the fact that he was prepared to take the advice of the Irish Prelates, whether or not he was willing to give them a definite voice in its government. A National Committee was appointed—the four Archbishops and four Suffragans, one from each province—a national collection was organised, which, so early as May, 1854, had produced £17,000. The Rector, although an Englishman, was, as all admit, the best that could be chosen. Celtic talent was, however, many people think, too much ignored in the composition of the original professoriate.

In spite of Dr. Cullen's best exertions, the institution from that day to this has led a struggling existence. Two well-meant attempts were made by Government—one by Lord Mayo, and the other by Mr. Gladstone—to do justice to Catholics. Both attempts miscarried, unfortunately as some people think, but such was not the opinion of Cardinal Cullen. He was not a man of compromise when he thought principle at stake. He would have the denominational system pure and simple, or nothing at all.

What he would have thought of the Royal University Scheme it is difficult to say. We earnestly hope it will work well for the interests of Catholic education, and wish it every success ; but there are many thinking men who watch the experiment with some distrust, or we should rather say, with a kind of benevolent anxiety, lest perhaps it might accomplish the very purpose it was designed to counteract.

We said in the beginning that secret societies were always an abomination to Dr. Cullen ; the vigorous onslaughts which he makes on them in these volumes abundantly prove it. And certainly this is not unnatural. An Irishman who only knew their action in Ireland, which is bad enough, and saw with his own eyes the cruelties and oppression against which they vainly struggled, might, while condemning them, have some sympathy for their members ; but he had none. He was, in truth, in some respects, more a Roman than an Irishman. He went to the Eternal City at the age of twenty years, and lived there twenty-nine years when he was made Primate. He had, moreover, seen with his own eyes the diabolical conduct of these secret societies in Rome. He had seen them expel

a liberal Pope, assassinate his Prime Minister, and outrage religion in every possible way. He knew that those societies, in various countries, were in league with each other, and that their leaders were in frequent and intimate communication. So, from the very beginning, he denounced and crushed the Ribbonmen in Armagh. When he came to Dublin, in 1852, he carried on the warfare; but there was no occasion for speaking out for some years. In 1858 Fenianism really began. Mr. James Stephens and Mr. John O'Mahony made their escape to Paris after the unsuccessful movement of 1848. They remained there for some time, and were thoroughly trained in the principles, and honoured with the friendship, of the worst leaders of that central revolutionary school.

After completing his political education in the French capital, Mr. Stephens returned to his native country in 1858, and worked so successfully, especially in the neighbourhood of Skibbereen, with the assistance of Jeremiah O'Donovan—Rossa was afterwards added—that before the year was over the district was ripe for revolt. But the Government had heard all about the plot. A raid was made upon the conspirators on the 3rd December, 1858, their leaders were tried and convicted in the following spring, and the Phoenix Conspiracy disappeared from history; but not the men. Henceforward America became the basis of operations, although Ireland was to be the theatre of the war. What has since been called the Dynamite Policy was openly advocated, both in New York and San Francisco, by Mooney's *Express* and other journals. Terence Bellew MacManus, one of the '48 refugees died in the last-named city in 1861. It was resolved to bury him in Ireland, and give him a national funeral. The 10th of November was the day named for interment; but Dr. Cullen refused permission for the corpse to lie in any church within his jurisdiction.¹

¹ Mr. A. M. Sullivan, in *New Ireland*, thus refers to this incident:—“Some one suggested that the body of the dead rebel should be disinterred from its grave in foreign soil, and be borne with public ceremonial across continent and ocean to the land of his birth. The proposition was enthusiastically embraced. It was a proceeding which appealed powerfully to the sympathies of the people.

“It was only when the ‘funeral’ preparations had been somewhat advanced, a whisper went round that the affair was altogether in the

In a Pastoral Letter on the 8th of December, the very next month, he attacked the revolutionists with vigour: "They render more intolerable the grievances they pretend to redress, drunkenness is encouraged at their meetings, their members are taught to violate the rights of property, and their deeds often terminate in bloodshed and murder." This is severe enough; what follows is worse. "Not only are they cut off like rotten branches from the Church, but amongst them are traitors, who, while most noisily denouncing the Government, are in the pay of the Castle as spies."

Public denunciations like this did not tend to make Dr. Cullen a popular favourite. He never was beloved by the "Nationalists," and he never valued their applause or feared their hatred. In October, 1865, when Fenianism was ripening for its doom, he published another letter "On Orangeism and Fenianism," in which he attacks the leaders of the movement: "Who are its leaders? What public service have they rendered to the country? What claim have they to demand our confidence? Are they men of religion? Are they men remarkable for sobriety, good conduct, and attention to their business? Are they men to whom *you would lend money*, or entrust with the management of your property?" He evidently expects the answer "No," and adds that the Fenian Paper called the *Irish People*, "was a vehicle of scandal, and circulated in its columns corrupt and poisonous maxims."

hands of the Fenian leaders, and was being used to advance their projects. Indeed, at one time, the purpose was seriously entertained of making the MacManus demonstration the signal for insurrection. The idea was vehemently and successfully combated by Mr. Stephens, on the ground that his preparations had been only begun. The Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, *aware of what underlay the proceedings*, refused to permit any lying-in-state or other public ceremonial in the churches of his diocese—a decision which drew upon him the wildest denunciations. With great cleverness the revolutionary leaders called any opposition to their arrangements 'enmity to the dead,' 'hostility to love of country.' Five years later, when the Fenian chiefs themselves avowed that the funeral was the expedient whereby they really established their movement in Ireland, the conduct of the Archbishop was better understood by many who were among the loudest in censuring him at the time. That day gave the Fenian chiefs a command of Ireland which they had never been able to obtain before. Some of the Fenian authorities have estimated that a larger number of adherents were sworn in during the three weeks of the MacManus obsequies than during the two previous years." See page 245.

Even ten years later, when Fenianism seemed to be dead and buried, he had it again condemned in the Synod of Maynooth in 1875.

Yet, he says, there are true patriots ; “ not the dissipated, the drunkard, the men who spend their days in idleness and their nights in bad company, hatching plots and conspiracies—these are not patriots. The true lover of his country is the man who shuns sin and scandal ; who is sober and temperate ; who practices the duties of his religion : who performs the obligations of his state of life, and trains up his children to be industrious like himself : such a man contributes to the real interests of the country, by his integrity, industry, and energy ; he is a good citizen and a good father.” And with regard to his country, “ her literature, her history, her antiquities, her ruins, her victories, her heroes, her sages, everything connected with her glories, will be to him a subject of pride.” If the doctrine laid down so clearly in these extracts is not “ patriotic,” it is certainly worthy of a Christian Prelate, and in accordance with the dictates of common sense.

There was perhaps no phase of the late Cardinal’s character more praiseworthy and characteristic than his generous loyalty towards the Holy See. He was indeed an Ultramontane of the purest water ; “ he respected and venerated the decisions of the Holy See ” in all things, great and small. It was not merely that in the domain of faith and morals he regarded that See as infallible—not merely that he was prepared to give to the Pontiff a constitutional obedience according to the canons. Rome’s slightest wish secured his unhesitating compliance ; filial love took the place of formal obedience, and knew no distinction between wishes and commands. In the very first of these documents, written from the Holy City, he describes, in eloquent and touching language, the unfading glories of the capital of the Christian world, “ the common home and country of all Catholics.” He declares his deep regret at having to bid her farewell, adding that his heart will always fondly turn to Rome—that she will always be the centre of his affections, and the beginning of his joys. In like manner, his love and reverence for Pius IX. were intensified by his personal friendship for

the man and veneration for the saint. His loyalty to the Pontiff did not spring merely from a sense of duty ; it gushed forth from the heart's highest and holiest affections. There was the same difference between his devotion to the Pontiff, and the obedience of other prelates, as between the loyalty of the old cavaliers to the House of Stuart, and the modern article which is motived and limited by the Bill of Rights.

Of course, Dr. Cullen gave constant expression to those sentiments, and so it was said he was an Ultramontane, and denationalised the Catholic Church of Ireland. Those who know anything of National Churches, in the Gallican sense of the term, would be very thankful if this were true. As a matter of fact, however, we never had a " National " Church in Ireland in that sense of the word, and it is to be hoped we never shall. The thing itself is evil, and the tendency thereto, be it great or small, is dangerous. All Dr. Cullen's influence effected was to intensify the fidelity of the Irish Church towards the See of Rome, which is the centre of unity ; and all who regard it as such, will not think that in these evil days the bonds of union between the head and the members can be drawn too close.

As might be expected, throughout his entire career, the late Cardinal was the uncompromising champion of the rights of the Holy See, and at every stage thoroughly approved of the great doctrinal acts of the late Pontiff. Hence we find in these volumes the most vehement denunciations of the Sardinian Government. He exposes the fraud and perjury of its agents, " the sworn enemies of the Pope, the defenders of treason and sedition, of rebellion and the dagger, of revolution, immorality, and infidelity." And he points out more than once that the English Government and the English press aided and abetted Cavour and Garibaldi in all their schemes of spoliation and robbery ; and that if their title to government over Irish people were to be tried on the same principles which they applied and applauded in the Papal States, their tenure of power in Ireland would be of very brief duration.

One cannot easily find a more exhaustive defence of the rights of the Holy See than is contained in the address delivered

in Dublin by Dr. Cullen at a public meeting, held on the 9th of January, 1860.

We cannot notice the share which the late Cardinal took in the great public acts of the Holy See—the defining of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception in 1854, and especially of the Infallibility of the Pope at the Vatican Council in 1869. He delivered several public addresses, too, contained in these volumes, in which these great dogmas are explained and defended. Neither can we stay to refer to the part which he played in the Synod of Maynooth in 1875. He was regarded by many as a stern disciplinarian; but those who best know the inner history of this Synod, all declare that his great influence was constantly employed to moderate the severity of many of its disciplinary canons.

We take the liberty of recommending the perusal of these volumes, so beautifully printed and splendidly bound, to all who would clearly understand the history of the Irish Church for the third quarter of the present century, as well as to those who for their own guidance may wish to examine the gradual unfolding of a great policy, and to ascertain the enduring fruits of its development.

CONSECRATION SERMON.¹

"You have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you; and I have appointed you, that you should go and should bring forth fruit; and your fruit should remain; that whatsoever you shall ask the Father in My name He may give it you."—*S. John*, xv. 16.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EMINENCES, MY LORDS BISHOPS,
VERY REV. AND REV. FATHERS, AND DEARLY BELOVED—

We are all assembled here to-day to take part in what is perhaps the most sublime and significant function in the majestic ritual of the Catholic Church. The high priest of this archdiocese has consecrated this beautiful temple, and in the name of all the clergy, and all the people, and of all Ireland, has given it over to God to be His House for ever—a House of Prayer and a House of Sacrifice, the Throne of His Grace and the Fountain of His Mercy; for, as God Himself has declared, "His Eyes and His Heart will be here always." Most fitly, too, this new Cathedral in this primatial city of Armagh has been dedicated to God under the invocation of our National Apostle, St. Patrick. Under God, St. Patrick is the central figure here to-day, not only as titular and patron, but also in a sense as the primary founder of this church, for I look upon it as the latest outcome of his apostolic work in Ireland. There is, of course, no other name of saint or hero in our history so dear to the heart of the Irish people as St. Patrick's. It is a great name in Heaven, for the saints of his family are countless before the throne of God; and his name is a great and living power on earth also, not alone in Ireland, but wherever the children of the Irish race are scattered throughout the world. It is that great name that has built this Church here in his own City of Armagh, and it is that name that has brought us all here to-day to bless this building and give it over for ever to God and to St. Patrick. Wherefore it is of Patrick and of his life and work in Ireland that I shall speak to-day before this illustrious assemblage.

¹Preached on the occasion of the Consecration of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Armagh, on the 24th June, 1904.

If ever there was an apostle outside the twelve and St. Paul, to whom the words of my text are applicable in the fullest sense, that man was St. Patrick. His vocation or call to the ministry was not the ordinary one, manifested by special fitness and the voice of superiors; it was a personal supernatural call from God. His commission to preach in Ireland did not come from the Pope merely; it was an extraordinary commission, like that of St. Paul, from Christ Himself; he was called to leave his country to prepare himself for his work, and afterwards preach the Gospel. With God's help, he produced abundant fruit, and that fruit has remained in a very marvellous manner. And, lastly, God bestowed upon him not only the gift of efficacious prayer, but all the manifold supernatural powers which Our Saviour promised to the Twelve when sending them forth to preach the Gospel. These are the points to which I chiefly wish to direct your attention.

In fact that verse from St. John sums up the whole history of Patrick's life; it furnishes the key to his character; it and it alone explains his wonderful mission in Ireland. If we read the Confession of the Saint, a work beyond doubt authentic, with these words of Our Saviour before our mind, we can see the man of God as he really was—humble, penitent, prayerful, of lofty purpose and dauntless courage, heedless of self, zealous for God, passionately devoted to his flock. In the Confession he lays bare all the workings of his heart in rugged language, but with a directness that compels our assent. Yet it is a very wonderful story, which can only be fully understood by those who believe in Patrick's supernatural life and mission. "You have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you," said Our Saviour to the Twelve. It was a personal supernatural call to preach in Ireland. He was chosen by God, as Moses was chosen, to bring the Irish people out of the land of bondage into the freedom of the Kingdom of God. There were people then, as there are people now, who thought Patrick was mistaken in declaring that it was the voice of God called him to preach in Ireland. They said, in effect, like the Jews of old, "the Lord hath not appeared to you; yours is a rash and dangerous undertaking, for which you are not fitted by any special training or education." And Patrick for a time was

sore perplexed ; but he heard the voice of the Spirit of God within him clearly speaking to his heart. The Word of the Lord came to him, as it came to the prophets of old, " at sundry times and in divers manners," but always to the same effect ; so that he felt impelled to obey the mandate of the Lord. The angel Victor came to him with letters innumerable calling him to Ireland ; the voices of the children from Fochlut's Wood by the western sea were ever ringing in his ears ; the Holy Spirit spoke to his heart, and he was assured in clearest words that " He who gave His life for him, He it was that spoke within him." When certain elders opposed his purpose of going to preach in Ireland he tells us that the same Holy Spirit encouraged him to persevere in carrying out that purpose, " which I have learned from Christ my Lord." It has been said that these things are the fancies of an excited imagination, or the promptings of an ardent spirit ; but Patrick himself believed beyond doubt that they were the voice of God ; and so also do we believe—and Ireland's history proves it. " I have chosen you and I have appointed you." The appointment or formal commission to teach only came to Patrick after thirty years of waiting and of preparation ; and, like the call, it was supernatural. All the ancient Lives tell us that he got his crozier, the Staff of Jesus, from Christ Himself. St. Patrick himself says the same in effect. His nephew, Secundus, who wrote a hymn in praise of the Saint, the authenticity of which cannot be questioned, expressly says that Patrick, like Paul, had a special mission from God to preach, not to all nations, but to the tribes of Ireland.

Of course, besides this extraordinary commission from God, he had also the ordinary commission from the Pope, St. Celestine. All the ancient Lives of the Saint assert it ; all our native annalists assert it ; the *Book of Armagh*, the official record of the primatial see, asserts it ; the ablest Protestant writers, like Usher, have admitted it. In fact, the " Roman Mission " was never questioned until our own times, and then only for controversial purposes by certain scholars who had nothing to rely on but a purely negative argument—that if the Pope had sent him to preach in Ireland, Patrick would have certainly mentioned the fact in the Confession. He did

not mention it, just because it was perfectly well known to those whom he addressed ; and, secondly, because his main purpose was to vindicate himself against the charge of rashness and presumption in undertaking a great and dangerous work for which he was not qualified by early education and previous training. He admits candidly his own unworthiness and want of early education resulting from his captivity in Ireland. His defence is that the task was put upon him not by man, but by God, that he had a divine mandate to preach in Ireland notwithstanding his unworthiness—for he says that he was a stone sunk in the mire—and then he appeals to the success of his mission in Ireland as the clearest proof that his commission was divine, and that God was with him in his work. That is precisely what Our Saviour Himself gives as the effect of his own mission to the apostles—that they should bring forth fruit, and that their fruit should remain. The argument of the Saint was irresistible, his statements were undeniable. He might appeal to the fact that Pelagius was commissioned by the Pope to preach in Ireland ; but that commission in the case of Pelagius did not bring success, because the work was not assigned to him by God. Patrick claimed to have a still higher commission, from Christ Himself, and he points to the marvellous fruit of his preaching in Ireland as the clearest proof that God was with him in his work. But St. Paul, though divinely authorised to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, “went to Jerusalem to see Peter, with whom he tarried fifteen days,” before he set out on his first public mission. No prelate of the western Church in the fifth century would dream of setting out to preach in a new territory without the sanction of Peter, that is, the Pope. It was the Pope sent St. Ninian to preach to the Southern Picts, it was the Pope sent Pelagius to Ireland the year before he sent Patrick, and we all know it was the Pope sent St. Augustine to England. Rome was the fountain from which England, Ireland and Scotland received the faith. Those who adhered to Rome kept the faith ; those who broke away from Rome lost it. “I have chosen you, and have appointed you, that you should go and bring forth fruit.”

In fulfilment of this command Patrick, like St. Paul, left

home and friends and country and high station and worldly prospects. His country, "*patria*," was undoubtedly some part of Great Britain—he says so himself; his parents, or it may be his relations, "*parentes*," were there; and they sought to keep him at home by every means that affectionate ingenuity could devise. When he returned home after his escape from Ireland they received him with the warmest and most sincere affection, and they earnestly besought him, that after the many tribulations which he had endured, he would never leave them again. When he declared his fixed purpose to obey the divine command, they still implored him with prayers and tears to stay at home; and they offered him large gifts, he says, to induce him to stay with them. But, like St. Paul in similar circumstances, he would not listen to the claims of flesh and blood. He gave up his home, his country, his friends, and broke all the bonds of natural affection that he might hearken to the voice of God that called him away—"I have appointed you, that you should go and bring forth fruit." That was the only voice he heard—the only voice he obeyed. He went forth in the face of the most formidable difficulties to prepare himself for the task which God had imposed upon him. He had hitherto received no training in the school of rhetoric or philosophy. He had almost forgotten the provincial Latin which was his mother tongue, and, as he admits himself, he never after acquired it properly. When other youths are at school or college he was herding swine on the hills of Antrim, and he was rather old to begin to learn now. Yet he had to learn much, not only secular knowledge, but moral theology, Scripture, ecclesiastical discipline, and rubrics—all that he was destined to teach afterwards to his clergy in Ireland. His counsellors in Britain thought it a rash and hopeless undertaking; but the voice of God encouraged him, and the cry of the children from the wild woods by the western sea was ever ringing in his ears.

First it would appear he went to the great monastery of Martin at Tours—Martin was his mother's kinsman—there he was trained in the religious life, and received the clerical tonsure. Thence he made his way to Germanus of

Auxerre, scholar, statesman and warrior ; no longer, however, leading the armies of Rome, but soldiers of the Cross. There, under the greatest prelate in France, he made much progress in the sacred sciences, especially in the study of Scripture, with which he shows himself thoroughly familiar, both in its letter and spirit. Thence, by the advice of Germanus, he went further south to the great school of Arles, in which Germanus had studied, and from Arles most probably to Lerins, which was itself the fountain head of the learning of Ireland. Finally, by the advice of Germanus, he sought out the great Pope Celestine, but the holy Pontiff at first declined to have Patrick consecrated to the Irish mission because Pelagius had been sent already by the Pope. When, however, it was ascertained that Pelagius had given up the Irish mission and died in Scotland, that obstacle was removed, and Patrick was duly consecrated with the sanction of the Pope, and sent to preach in Ireland. "I have appointed you, that you should go and bring forth fruit." Patrick was a very different man from Pelagius. Both were received in the same hostile spirit by the same savage chief when they landed in County Wicklow. Pelagius, after some delay, turned and fled to Scotland ; but Patrick was a man of courage and resolution, and though driven from Wicklow, he was not dismayed or disheartened. After a short stay in Down he resolved to confront the high king with all his fierce chiefs and druids on the hill of Tara itself. He had his life in his hands and he knew it, but trusted in God, and God visibly protected him. The enemies of the Gospel were overthrown, and the Saint received from the high king a reluctant permission to preach the Gospel throughout the whole island.

It was a prolonged and laborious apostolate encompassed with manifold dangers, but fruitful beyond the Saint's most sanguine hopes. For sixty years Patrick laboured in Ireland, thirty of which he spent in missionary journeys throughout the whole island, and the last thirty he chiefly spent here in Armagh consolidating his work. It is not easy for us now to realise all the difficulties he had to face. There were no roads at the time, but mere tracks ; there were no bridges, no hotels. For the most part, he and his attendants—his 'family' as they are

called—had to camp out and provide themselves with everything they needed. He had to build his churches, to write his own books when the original supply was exhausted. He had to make his sacred vessels and altar stones, to train and educate his own clerics at first in a kind of itinerant school for all the grades of the sacred ministry, and he had to do all this throughout the whole country, north, south, east and west. He penetrated through the misty hills and watery moors of Connaught and Ulster, where no Christian voice was ever heard before. We find his bed and his well in the heart of the Twelve Bennis in Connemara. He spent a whole Lent on the summit of Croagh Patrick fasting and praying for Ireland. We find traces of his sojourn in the islands of the great lakes and even of the far western ocean. Twelve times, he tells us, his life was in peril; on one occasion his devoted servant was slain by his side, because he was mistaken for the master. He was often insulted by the unbelievers, and once, at least, he was put in bonds. But he pursued his work undeterred by all these dangers and difficulties. God was with him. What he blessed was visibly blessed by God; what he banned withered up like the fig-tree cursed by Our Saviour.

There is no more striking trait in the character of the great apostle than his disinterestedness in preaching the Gospel. He describes it himself in necessary self-defence. "Though I baptized so many thousands of men," he says, "did I ever hope to get from any of them so much as half a scruple? Although the Lord ordained clerics everywhere by my poor ministry, did I not give that ministry gratis? If ever I asked from any of them so much as the price of a shoe, tell me and I will restore it." Like St. Paul, he was a burden to no man, and preached the Gospel without hope of earthly reward. His converts indeed laid generous gifts upon the altar, which Patrick must have needed, not for himself but to carry on the work of the ministry. He had to bestow gifts, he says, on the kings, and give wages to their sons to protect him in preaching the Gospel. We know from the example of Daire, who gave Patrick the site of his chief church on yonder hill, how hard it was to manage the wild chieftains of the time. But Patrick's prudent and steadfast courage conquered them; and from his heart he thanks

God again and again, who blessed his labours with such abundant fruit. The whole island became Christian, and the hearts of the people were fervent in faith and strong in grace ; “ the sons of the Scots became monks, and their daughters in crowds became Virgins of Christ ”—giving up all things for Him, so that the men of Erin, he tells us, who before worshipped idols and things unclean, now became “ the people of the Lord,” and “ sons of the Living God.” How dearly he loved his flock, which he won for Christ at the ends of the earth, he shows by word and deed. He would not leave them even for a short time to visit his friends in Britain, or see the faces of the saints in Gaul once more. When some members of his flock were maltreated by the tyrant Coroticus, he bewails them in the language of a mother robbed of her children, and fiercely denounces the vengeance of God on the tyrant and his accomplices. For their sake he lived and laboured ; and for them he was ready to die ; nay, even to have his body cast out unburied, to become a prey piecemeal to the dogs and beasts and birds of heaven—he was ready to endure all for his flock if God so willed it.

Such was the apostle sent by “ Pope Celestine and by God’s Angel Victor,” as the *Book of Armagh* tells us, to convert our fathers to the faith. No wonder the fruit was abundant ; and surely it was abiding. “ I have appointed you that you should go and should bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain.” Yes, the fruit of Patrick’s preaching has remained in Ireland. I think I might venture to say, as it has remained nowhere else ; for nowhere else, where the faith has remained as a nation’s faith, were the trials and persecutions which the people endured for that faith so great and prolonged as they were in Ireland. I now merely mention the fact that if the fruit brought forth by the preaching of an Apostle has remained anywhere, it has remained in Ireland. It is a fact that no one has ever ventured to question. Not so in many places elsewhere. Where are now the great patriarchal churches of the East, founded by the Apostles themselves ? Well, they exist, but it is only in name. The Moslem dwells in St. Sophia ; the great churches of Cyprian and Augustine are no more ; Canterbury has no Divine Victim

on its altars. Iona is desolate ; the sea-birds nestle in Lindisfarne ; Melrose and Fountains Abbey attract tourists who admire their fallen glories ; but they have no community of faith or feeling with the holy men who dwelt in their beautiful cloisters. Not so in Ireland. Here, as elsewhere the material buildings were despoiled or overthrown ; and thanks to God, all over the country, as in Armagh, they are rising up again in more than their ancient splendour. But the spiritual edifice reared in Ireland by St. Patrick has never been overthrown—and why ? Because Patrick built his house upon the Rock, and that Rock was Peter, upon which Christ Himself built His Church. “ The rain fell and the floods came, and the winds, and they beat upon that house, yet it fell not, because it was founded on the Rock.” In the Collections of Tirechan in the *Book of Armagh*, dating back to the seventh century, we are told that after the death of Pelagius (who was also called Patricius or Patrick), “ the second Patrick was sent by the Angel of God, Victor by name, and by Celestine, the Pope ; in him, Patrick, all Ireland believed.” Patrick brought the Gospel message from Rome to Ireland. When he heard in the far West of the accession of Pope Leo the Great, the Saint sent his own nephew Munis from Croagh Patrick “ with counsel for the Abbot of Rome,” as the *Annals of Ulster* tells us ; and his messenger brought back the blessing of the Pope on Patrick’s work, and the confirmation of his Apostolate in Ireland. In the *Book of Armagh* there are four dicta or maxims of St. Patrick, which were ever on his lips, and one of them was—“ *Ut Christiani ita et Romani sitis* ”—as you are Christians built on Christ, so be ye Romans built on Peter—you cannot be one except you are also the other. That maxim he inculcated all his life and with his latest breath on the Irish prelates and the Irish people ; it was inserted amongst his dicta in the official record of his primatial church ; and it was never forgotten by Patrick’s bishops or by their successors. In the same *Book of Armagh* was inserted the famous Canon of Patrick’s Synod, directing appeals in all the causæ majores—the most difficult and important causes—to be sent to Rome. The acts of this Synod are recognised as authentic by the most competent

authorities ; and the *Book of Armagh* quotes the Canon expressly as decreed by Auxilius, Patricius, Secundinus, and Benignus—the two latter his dearest friends and coadjutors. So we find Patrick by this solemn synodical decree formally directing his successors and the other Irish prelates to transmit the causæ majores to Rome, “ to be decided by the authority at the Apostolic See of Peter, which has jurisdiction over the City of Rome.”

In the seventh century when such a grave case arose in Ireland regarding the Paschal controversy, and the Irish prelates were divided amongst themselves, it was unanimously resolved in accordance with the Canon of St. Patrick, as St. Cummian expressly states, to send delegates to Rome for a final decision of the question. “ They went as children to their mother ; ” they heard the teaching and saw the practice of Rome, which was found to be different from the Irish practice, and when they returned with their report, the Roman usage was at once accepted by the Irish Church, Iona alone holding out for some time longer. During the Danish wars communication with Rome was infrequent and difficult, but certainly did not cease, as I might easily show if time allowed.

No sooner, however, was the Irish Church free to reform herself than at once her prelates turned to Rome for light and guidance. Inar O'Hagan, the teacher of St. Malachy, and one of the authors of that reformation, died on his pilgrimage in Rome. St. Malachy, the great primate who reformed the Church of Armagh and of Down and of all Ireland, went in person to Rome to confer with the Pope, and Innocent II. put his own mitre on his head and his own stole about his neck, thereby constituting him his Legate, and so with plenary powers sent him back to Ireland. At a later period Christian of Lismore, one of Malachy's friends and monks, became Papal Legate ; and so the good work of reformation spread apace under the guidance, and by the authority of the Holy See. Another Papal Legate, Cardinal Paparo, the first Cardinal that ever appeared in Ireland, presided at the great Synod of Kells, in 1152—before the Norman ever set foot in Ireland—in which the four Archbishops for the first time received their pallia from the Pope, and the Irish Dioceses were determined

in number and circumscription practically as they are at present. Since that Synod down to the present day, as every one knows and admits, the Catholic Church in Ireland continued in the most intimate communion with the Apostolic See. When the day of trial came, and the whole weight of the English power was brought to bear on Catholic Ireland in order to destroy the Faith, it was communion with Rome that saved it. They were anchored in the rock, and they clung to it, immovable in the fierce storm that swept over them. 'Twas the wine from the Royal Pope that gave them spirit and light in their darkest hours ; it was missionaries from Rome that kept the faith alive in the hearts of the people ; it was money from the papal treasuries that kept the Irish students in their foreign colleges and the Irish prelates and priests at home from starving. Therefore I say that Patrick's work has remained, because he built his house upon the Rock, and that Rock was Peter, on which Christ Himself declared He had built the Church. But there was under God another cause for the perseverance of the Irish people in the faith, and that was the earnest, persevering, efficacious prayer of Patrick himself. Our Saviour had promised that " whatsoever you ask the Father in My name He will give it to you." That promise was a part of Patrick's commission ; he realised it in a way that few saints have ever realised it ; and for him it was fulfilled in a very marvellous manner.

I have already pointed out that Patrick claimed an immediate divine call, and subsequently a divine commission to preach the Gospel in Erin. He was thoroughly acquainted with the Sacred Scripture ; he knew the promise of Our Saviour given to the Apostles, and he claimed its fulfilment in his own case with the most importunate insistence—" whatever you ask the Father in My name He will give it to you,"—that was the promise. He resolved to ask for the preservice of the Irish people in the faith as a nation, and it was granted to him. Such is my view ; and it explains what otherwise it is difficult to explain—Patrick's wrestling in prayer with God on the Holy Mountain during his forty days' fast on its wind-swept summit. I have heard good men say—theologians, too—why spend the whole Lent on the windy summit of that

desolate hill? Why so daring in his petitions? Why so extravagant in his demands? Why so insistent in their iteration? My text explains it all—whatever you, the Apostle of Ireland, ask the Father in My name that He will grant you. He cannot refuse it, because it has been promised by infallible Truth. That thought was in Patrick's mind; more than a mother's love was in his heart for his flock, and not only for his flock in his own time, but for their children to the end of the world. In prophetic spirit he saw the trials of the future, therefore, with the tears rolling down his cheeks and the yells of tormented devils still sounding in his ears, he besought the Lord for Whom he had suffered so much to hear his earnest passionate prayers for his flock; and he would not, even at the bidding of the Angel, leave the Holy Mountain until he got an assurance from God that they were heard and granted. Then he said *Deo gratias*, and descended like Moses from the Irish Sinai.

There is a strange story told in the old "Lives of the Saints," that shows how dearly Patrick loved his Irish children. They tell us that he left seven of his own religious family—one on each of the commanding hills that overlooked the land—to keep watch and ward over his beloved flock and their children until the day of doom. It is true in one sense at least that Patrick and the saints of his family in heaven have watched over and prayed for Ireland during all the dreadful years of the past, and it may be that God's angel guardians at Patrick's prayer are stationed by God on those lone summits to watch over the hills and valleys of holy Ireland. And it was not for Ireland merely, for the Irish have been the apostles of many lands. I need not tell this learned assemblage of the missionary labours of the Irish saints and scholars during the interval between St. Patrick's death and the Danish invasions, when they were the greatest christianising and civilising influence in western Europe. The same missionary zeal has manifested itself in our time, so that the children of St. Patrick have been the chief means of propagating the Catholic Faith throughout all English-speaking countries.

I said in the beginning that I looked upon this splendid

temple as the latest outcome of Patrick's spiritual work in Ireland—that he is, as it were, its primary founder. This is, I think, undeniable. Crolly, a great and good Primate, began the work on a scale of what, at the time (that is in 1840), was daring magnificence, and funds were collected from the clergy and people throughout all Ireland. Then the famine intervened, and the work was arrested. Dixon, learned and laborious, in 1854 took up the unfinished work, and inaugurated it by a Pontifical High Mass within its unroofed walls, which was celebrated in a fierce storm that might be regarded as a symbol of the fiercer storm of persecution from which the Catholics of the North were just then emerging. But the builders weathered both storms, the work went on steadily, large sums coming from America to help its progress. The Venerable M'Gettigan built the twin towers that rise so proudly over the sacred hill, and blessed the church in 1873. Another illustrious son of old Tirconnell has now completed the work in a style of the highest artistic elegance ; and to-day, in presence of the Papal Legate, his Eminence has given it over to God and St. Patrick. Still Patrick is the primary founder. His name is a power wherever the children of the Gael are scattered over the world. The Primates I have named got the money to build and decorate this church because they are the spiritual heirs of Patrick. He lives again in his successors ; their voice is the voice of Patrick ; their power is the power of Patrick. In the past the prelate who got possession of the insignia of Patrick—his Crozier, his Bell, and Book—was regarded as the living representative of Patrick, and heir to all his power and privileges. Armagh itself was St. Patrick's sacred city—a centre of learning and authority for all the land ; and it became a place of pilgrimage for all Ireland. The pilgrims deemed themselves happy if they died in Armagh and were buried in its sacred soil. The greatest of the Irish Kings, who fell at Clontarf, not only visited Patrick's city whilst living, and made rich offerings to Patrick's altar, but he ordered his body to be taken to Armagh and buried in its sacred soil. Then succeeded evil days for the ancient faith and for the ancient race. There was a time when the Catholics were driven from Armagh as the Jews were driven

from Jerusalem ; but it has happily passed away. The temple has been rebuilt, the priesthood restored, and the throne of Patrick again set up in his own city. His glory lightens over all those marble altars ; his name resounds from this pulpit ; it is his voice that has called you here, and it is his hand and the Pope's that will bless you when this sermon is over. This vast assemblage—prelates, priests and people—have come from afar, but it is one purpose inspires them all to give glory to God and honour to Patrick and to Patrick's heir. Our Holy Father the Pope, successor of that St. Celestine who sent St. Patrick to preach to our fathers, has sent here an illustrious Cardinal all the way from Rome, as his Legate, to preside in this assembly, to bring his blessing to us on this great day, and to show the whole world that this noble temple, like that which Patrick first built in Armagh, is built upon the Rock, and that, as we are Christians, so we are Romans, as united and as devoted to the See of Peter now as our fathers had always been in the past. Last night I heard the letter read which he bears from Our Holy Father the Pope to his Eminence the Cardinal Primate, and which I have no doubt will be published in a few days. It is a beautiful and touching letter, and shows the ardent affection which Our Holy Father has for the Irish people. It would be impossible to read or to see anything more touching or more beautiful.

I believe I can speak in the name of the prelates here, of the clergy here, and of the people here, when I say that we return to Our Holy Father and to his Eminence the Cardinal, our most grateful and heartfelt thanks, and assure him that it is a favour we can never forget, and that the mission of his Eminence to this church to-day has been the means of binding us closer in intimate and loyal union with the See of St. Peter. And the Irish Bishops are here to-day to show their love for St. Patrick and for the heir of Patrick, and pay their homage to the Primate of all Ireland. The clergy, secular and regular, are here to-day in greater numbers than I have ever seen before, to join their pastors in paying this loving homage to the Chair of our National Apostle. Many prelates of England and Scotland are here, headed by the successor of St. Augustine to testify to their union with us in faith and charity,

and pay the homage of themselves and of their flocks to the memory of the great Saint who came to us from Britain, and whose spiritual children of Irish birth or blood are to-day the mainstay of their flocks in the Britain of Columba, Augustine and Bede. In the same spirit, and for the same purpose, we see here to-day countless crowds of the laity of all ranks and conditions in life from the first of England's nobles, noblest in blood, but nobler still in unswerving faith and stainless honour, down to the dusty wayfarers who have come hither from Ulster's farthest hills and valleys to join in the ceremonial of this great day. Neither Armagh nor any other part of Ireland has ever seen an assemblage like this on a similar occasion. It was a great day recorded in our annals when Cormac's beautiful chapel on the Rock of Cashel was consecrated by the archbishop and bishops of Munster, and "the nobles of Ireland, both lay and ecclesiastical," but it was really only a gathering of the South, while here, to-day, we have a gathering of all Ireland. There was another great assemblage when the Abbey Church of Mellifont was dedicated by the primate and the prelates and princes of Meath and Oriel, who gave generous offerings in gold, silver, and embroidery for the use of the church; but their numbers were not as great, their offerings were not so large, their character was not so representative as in this assembly gathered round the Cardinal Primate of Armagh. It is a celebration unique in its character, and will, I have no doubt, be recorded in our national annals down to remotest ages.

Nor has the City of Armagh ever seen such a church before. From the beginning it was a city of churches and of schools where Celt and Saxon met together to learn and pray. St. Patrick himself erected probably four churches, and it would appear that at one time there were no less than ten churches in all around this sacred hill. The first Cathedral built by Patrick himself on yonder hill, whose foundations he traced and blessed under the guidance of God's Angel Victor, was a comparatively small and plain building. It was often destroyed accidentally or deliberately by fire, and as often restored. It was often profaned and pillaged and used as a barracks or a fortress by the victors. It has long passed from

Catholic hands, and early in the last century was restored at great cost by the Protestant primates. But it can no longer vie either in its commanding site, or in grandeur of its proportions, or in the richness of its decorations, with this noble temple. It is no wonder then that this primatial city of holy Patrick should rejoice to-day. The ancient land of Oriel is glad. The hills of old Tirconnell feel a thrill of joy—all Catholic Ireland at home and the greater Ireland beyond the sea exult in the advent of this glorious day which gives over this national temple to God and St. Patrick. And they exult not only in the dedication of this splendid temple, but they also rejoice on this the episcopal jubilee of him who so worthily wields the crozier of St. Patrick. His Eminence is the 109th Primate who has sat in Patrick's Chair on this royal hill, a long and illustrious line, including saints and confessors and martyrs, great and holy names like Patrick and Benen, Celsus and Benignus, Malachy and Gelasius, Creagh, Plunket, and M'Mahon, whose virtues and sufferings light up our chequered story as with a light from Heaven; but his Eminence is the only one of that illustrious line that sat in Patrick's Chair clothed in the purple of Rome. My Lord Cardinal, Primate of all Ireland, and heir of St. Patrick, we bring your Eminence cordial greetings to-day, not only from our cities and towns, but from the remotest hills and valleys of holy Ireland; we offer you our hearty congratulations on this jubilee of your episcopal reign; and we pray God to prolong the life of your Eminence for many years to come. We rejoice that you have been spared to see this majestic church completed and given over to God and to St. Patrick on the very crown of this royal hill.

And looking back to-day from this mystic summit, where the milk-white hind "so often doomed to death yet fated not to die," like Patrick's hunted stag, has at length found shelter and repose; looking back through the perilous ages that are gone, is it not our duty, one and all, with grateful hearts to give a nation's thanks to God to-day, who guided us with the light of His grace and shielded us with the strength of His arm through the stress and storm of the past? Not to us, O Lord, but to Thy name give the glory. We have sinned and we have

suffered, but Thou didst not cast away Thy inheritance, nor make void the prayers of Patrick on the Holy Mountain, nor the blessings wherewith with uplifted hands he blessed this primatial city, and his entire flock throughout this land of his love. And do Thou, O mighty Lord, deign to be with us and our children in the future as Thou wast with our fathers through all the terrible past ; not on our works but on Thy great mercy and on the prayers of our blessed mother Mary and of all the Saints of Erin do we rely. To our Father and their Father—our own St. Patrick, the patron of this City and of this Cathedral—we make this day in his own temple a special appeal. He loved his flock, as we know, with a love stronger than death, and we love him in return with a deep and tender and abiding love. O, great Saint, watch over us as thou hast watched over our fathers ; pray for us as thou didst pray for them on this holy hill. May we learn from your bright example to fear the Lord our God, and walk in His ways, and love and serve the Lord our God with all our hearts and with all our souls. So this temple which we thy servants have built on this holy hill to the glory of God and the honour of thy name shall stand rooted in the rock, a memorial for the coming ages of the love for the beauty of God's house which fills the hearts of thine own people, a memorial of their undying devotion to thee, their Spiritual Father, and a memorial also of that steadfast faith which has conquered the world and their immortal hopes which have conquered the grave.

JOHN DUNS SCOTUS.

JOHN DUNS SCOTUS, the founder of the great school of theology which bears his name, must be carefully distinguished from his countryman and namesake, John Scotus Erigena. They are separated by an interval of nearly four centuries and a half, and although Erigena was famous as a philosopher and theologian, his renown is apt to be eclipsed by the still wider fame of the younger Scotus. Amongst the schoolmen pure and simple Duns Scotus is second to St. Thomas alone; although the Angelic Doctor may be the Jupiter of the scholastic Olympus, the Subtle Doctor certainly comes next:—

*Proximo illi tamen occupavit
Pallas honores.*

Even the voice of Leo XIII. in proclaiming the supremacy of Saint Thomas, proclaims by implication the greatness of the man who has so long held, and still holds with him, divided empire in the Schools. Like the heroes of chivalry they fight side by side against the Infidel, and then try the temper of their armour and the keenness of their steel in the tournaments of intellectual strife. In one field, at least, Scotus and his disciples have carried off the bays of victory. The Irish theologian was from first to last the great champion of Mary's Immaculate Conception. And what is equally to his honour, no Pope or council ever censured a single proposition in his voluminous writings.

The life of such a man, although spent entirely in the Schools, is certainly interesting and instructive. It will serve at least to give us an idea of the early history of the Franciscans in England, and of the way in which masters and students lived in the great mediæval Universities of Oxford and Paris—lecturing, disputing, praying, fasting, and, the scholars at least, not unfrequently fighting—in all

of which, as we shall see, the Irish students of the thirteenth century considerably distinguished themselves.

Most English writers, as might be expected, claim Scotus as their own in spite of his name. Ware quotes a postscript to the MS. of his works in Merton College in these words :—"Here end the readings of that Subtle Doctor of the University of Paris, Duns Scotus, who was born in a certain village in the parish of Emeldune, called Dunstone, in Northumberland." The name "Scotus" is altogether against this English claim, and a statement of this kind, made we know not when, or by whom, if indeed it were made at all, can have no weight in determining the controversy. Nor is the similarity between "Duns" and "Dunstone" such as to afford any plausible argument for the English claim.

The North Britons come next, and strongly assert that Scotus was born at a place called Duns, not far from the Scottish border, that he was in his youth educated at the Franciscan convent of Dumfries, and was afterwards sent to Oxford to complete his education. Luke Wadding shows at length that there is no foundation for this statement, and that a Franciscan convent could hardly have been founded at Dumfries at the time that we know for certain Scotus must have been a boy. He was born either in 1266 or 1274, for he certainly died in the year 1308, and all writers agree that he was either 43 or 34 years old when he died. We think the claim of Ireland must be admitted for the following reasons :—

1. Although his bearing the name Scotus is not by itself a conclusive proof of his Irish birth—for it was in the thirteenth century certainly applied both to Scotchmen and Irishmen—yet we think as it was a name given to Joannes Duns in France, and not in England, one may fairly infer that it was applied in its hitherto more usual continental signification to mean an Irishman, especially as the same cognomen had already been given to another distinguished Irish scholar well known to fame in France.

2. Scotus himself, in his treatise on Metaphysics, in illustrating an argument, says :—"As we should speak of

St. Francis or St. Patrick as a man, *ut homo*." Here the Irishman shows himself; as a Franciscan friar, he would naturally use the name of his own spiritual father in his illustration, and as a child of Ireland he would naturally connect with it the name of his own great Apostle, St. Patrick.

3. The name "Duns"¹ appears to point to *Dunum*, as Downpatrick was then called in Latin. John of Down, in Latin Joannes Dunensis, would be, very naturally, in a familiar patronymic shortened into Joannes Dunsis or Dunes, in which latter form we have the word itself written in a patent roll about this very time; and thus we get Joannes *Dunes* or *Duns*. When he went to France they added *Scotus*² for distinction sake in the great University of the nations, as Paris then was, and thus we get John Duns Scotus.

I confess what moves me more than any of these arguments to believe that Scotus was an Irishman is the perpetual tradition of the great Franciscan family itself. It is impossible that they could have forgotten in their order to what country Scotus belonged. He joined them young, and he died young; he was the most famous scholar of his time both in Oxford and in Paris; then and ever since he has been the great glory of his order; and in that order he was always reputed to be an Irishman. At the end of the fifteenth century Mauritius a Portu, an Irish Franciscan, afterwards Archbishop of Tuam, declares that Scotus, was his countryman, even in race and blood—*popularis meus*—and he wrote extensive commentaries on the works of Scotus. Another Franciscan, Hugh McCaghwell, Archbishop of Armagh (died in 1626), wrote a life of Scotus, in which he strenuously maintains the same statement; and the truly learned Luke Wadding proves it at length in the life of Scotus, prefixed to the splendid edition of his

¹ The name *Duns* has given origin to our English word *Dunce*. As a simpleton is sometimes ironically called a Solomon, so a blockhead was ironically called a Duns or Dunce.—STANIHURST.

² The name of the Irish Franciscan province at this time was *Scotia*. Scotland formed one province with England.—WADDING'S "Preface to the Works of Scotus."

works which he prefaced and published at Lyons in 1639.

A very natural objection to Scotus' Irish birth is, at first sight at least, the fact that we find him at Oxford while still a young man. But a more intimate acquaintance with the early history of the Friars Minor in England removes the difficulty.

The Franciscans first came to England in 1224, the year of their holy founder's death. They landed at Dover on the 11th of September—four clerks and five lay brothers in all—with Agnellus of Pisa at their head. They were so poor and mean-looking that, according to one account, a neighbouring magistrate locked them up as tramps in a barn until he could find leisure to inquire into their history in the morning. Next year they established themselves at Oxford, where they got a small house in a dirty suburb in the parish of St. Ebb. But the holiness and austerity of their lives soon won them proselytes. Friar Agnellus built them a school—*satis honesta*—says the chronicler; great doctors of the University joined them, one of whom, Philip of London, was afterwards warden in Ireland. Such was their zeal for knowledge that, bare-headed and bare-footed, in frost and snow and mud, they walked oftentimes long distances to attend the schools of theology. Yet many great men and nobles joined them, and in 1256 an eye-witness¹ tells us that they numbered 1,242 members in 49 different localities.

From England they passed over to Ireland, still retaining Oxford as their educational head-quarters. In 1233 we find them in Dublin, in 1240 in Waterford, and in 1266 we find them in *Dunum* or Downpatrick, where John de Courcy had founded a colony of Norman settlers. Most of these Irish houses sent their novices to be educated at Oxford, in which city, members of their own order were now the most distinguished professors of theology. Alexander Hales, Adam de Marisco, and Roger Bacon were famous throughout Europe, and their fame attracted great numbers from Ireland. In this matter we are not left to conjecture;

¹ Thomas de Eccleston—*De Adventu Minorum in Angliam*.

we have authentic evidence in the records of the University itself. In the *Munimenta Oxoniae*,¹ under date of the year 1255, we have a curious statute which proves how numerous and how noisy was the Hibernian element in Oxford. At this time there was a great strife of nations and of opinions, but there appears to have been a specially bitter jealousy between the Irish and the Northern English. Both parties were required to give bail to keep the peace, and we have a list of the names of thirty of their number, who became sureties for the good conduct of their fellow-countrymen. This list is exceedingly interesting, and proves conclusively that large numbers of Irishmen at that time received their education in the halls of Oxford.²

It is admitted on all hands that Scotus was both a student and professor in that great University, and thus had practical experience of every variety of scholastic life. The existence of Oxford University does not in all probability date beyond the beginning of the thirteenth century. Its alleged foundation by King Alfred is a myth, of which there is no positive proof whatsoever, and there is strong negative evidence against the supposition. Its first endowment, as far as we know, dates from the year 1214, and was a fine of fifty-two shillings yearly, which the townsmen agreed to pay for the use of poor scholars at Oxford, as a compensation for having hung certain students, who, we may presume, had grievously misbehaved themselves.³ It received its first Charter from Henry III., and its second source of endowment was the "chest" of 310 marks left by William of Durham, whose good example was followed by many other benefactors during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This "chest" was a very singular contrivance for assisting poor students to complete their studies. It

¹ Anno 1252. In ecclesia B. Mariæ in plena congregatione cum esset magna dissensio et discordia inter Boreales et Hibernienses mota, provisum est ad pacis ordinationem quod duodecim eligerentur de utraque parte qui firmam pacis ordinarent inter partes et in posterum servandam providerent. Vide—*Munimenta Oxoniae*, page 20, vol. 1.

² In the list we find such names as Robertus Prendergast, Joannes de Barry, Wilhelmus la Poer, Wilhelmus O'Ffelan.

³ *Munimenta Oxoniae*; and Introduction by Rev. H. Austey.

was not a metaphorical, but a real iron chest, generally kept in the church, and contained the bequest of its founder in genuine silver marks. There were two sworn guardians appointed to take charge of this chest, and distribute its contents in loans to the poor students. In return they were not only bound to say five *Paters* and *Aves* for the repose of the founder's soul on certain days, but also to give the guardians pledges, which were retained in the "chest" as security for the repayment of the loans. It was in fact a kind of literary pawn-office; and if the loans were not duly repaid, the pledges were publicly sold on certain fixed days. Manuscript books, often rare and valuable, cloaks, swords, daggers, silver cups—every kind of article likely to be found in a student's *camera* might be also found as a pledge in the chest. Both masters and students were permitted to borrow from the chest when they were in want of funds, and they appear to have fully availed themselves of the privilege. One poor fellow complains that he was left *cum una camisia*, because his second shirt was pledged for some small sum to extricate him from his difficulties. These chests appear to have been the principal source of endowment for many years at Oxford, and the most stringent regulations were made in the Statutes about the loans and the pledges.

We cannot determine exactly at what time young Scotus became a student at the University; it was in all probability about 1280, for he died in 1308 certainly not much over forty. And he came to Oxford very young, probably not more than twelve or fifteen years of age. It seems more probable, but by no means certain, that he joined the Franciscans, not at Oxford, but before he was sent there. We know that from the first appearance of the Dominicans and Franciscans in England they had their "halls" or houses in Oxford, and the example of their virtues and austerities seems to have produced a wonderful effect in the University City. We may assume that the private life of Duns Scotus was in all respects similar to that of his religious brothers at Oxford and elsewhere. The pages of the simple-minded Thomas de Eccleston

furnish us with a vividly graphic picture of the extraordinary poverty and austerity of their lives, and their discipline could not have been much relaxed in the time of Scotus. Their food was mostly brown bread; sometimes with the addition of a little oil, or sour beer, or porridge made of the meal which they begged from door to door. They walked two and two, bare-headed and bare-footed, in summer and winter, through frost and snow. The jeering and blaspheming soldier crossed himself when they had passed by, and he saw their footprints on the frozen road stained with blood. They were forbidden to build grand houses and churches. Their first convent in Cornhill was a wooden shed, the interstices between the boards being stuffed with dry grass. Tired and worn out with their day's labour they slept on a mattress without bolster or pillow, covered only with a single rug. They themselves washed the scanty inner clothing which they wore.¹ They built their convents by preference, as at Oxford, in the purlieus of the town, where the herds of wretched and neglected outcasts, who had fled from the tyranny of their feudal lords, found shelter under the shadow of the city walls. There the Franciscans lived, and prayed, and preached, even more by their example than their words—in all things Friars *Minors*, truly less than the least. "Is it any wonder," says the Protestant divine who has so ably edited the early records of the English Franciscans, "that in the dress of its new teachers Christianity should have appeared to the masses, as it had never yet appeared, radiant in attractiveness and beauty?"

And yet these very men, so unkempt and coarsely clad, were welcome in the palaces of kings; they became the trusted friends and advisers of great nobles like Simon de Montfort. Barons, knights, and lawyers—scions of the proudest houses in England and Ireland—the De Mariscos, Butlers, and De Burgos, joined the mendicant friars, captivated by their sanctity and learning. St. Francis, indeed, had forbidden his children to trust much to books;

¹ *Tempore Fratris Joannis mandavit Frater Helias ut fratres ipsi favarent femoralia sua.*—*Liber de Adventu Minorum*, p. 33.

but books, or, at least, lectures had become a necessity of the times, and here, too, the Friars Minors distanced all competitors. We have a list of sixty-seven of their divinity readers at Oxford (many of whom were also in Paris) and amongst them are the names of some of the most famous schoolmen in Europe. The masters and students crowded from all the halls in Oxford to hear their lectures, and hung on the words of subtlety, eloquence, and power, which fell from their lips.

We have seen Scotus in his convent amongst his brothers: let us now strive to form some idea of his work in the Schools.

There can be no doubt that very large numbers of the Oxford students were anxious to join the Friars Minors, and their enemies in the University who were jealous of their great success as teachers, accused them of inducing clever boys in the colleges to join their order. We find from the preamble of a university statute made at a later date, "that the nobles and people generally were afraid to send their sons to Oxford lest they should be induced to join the mendicant friars." Strenuous enactments were accordingly made by the authorities to repress the abuse, and it was declared that, "any friar so inducing a student under eighteen years of age to join his order shall not be permitted to give or attend lectures in the University for the year next ensuing."¹

It is easy to see how the bright-eyed Irish boy, who in after years led the schools of France and England, may have been noticed by the Franciscans of *Dunum*, or Downpatrick, and how he might be induced to join their order for the double purpose of serving God, and slaking that insatiable thirst for knowledge which was the ruling passion of his life. Joannes Major says that he was taken up by two brothers of the order and brought to Oxford—Cave says, from Newcastle Convent, in which he was a novice—but he most probably was brought by the two brothers from their Convent in Dunum, and if, as Luke Wadding says, *Scotia* was the name given by St. Bonaventure to the

¹ Vid. *Munimenta*, p. 205, vol. i.

Irish province of the order, there can be no doubt but his French name of Scotus proves his Irish origin quite conclusively. Joannes Major adds that Magister Gulielmus Varro was his tutor or lecturer in Oxford, and that when the latter went to Paris, young Scotus was chosen to fill the vacant place. Varro was, it seems, the principal of the "school," which Scotus attended at Oxford. There were both "schools" and "halls" (which must not be confounded), in the University; the Franciscans, however, had a "hall," or house of their own, in the southern suburbs of Oxford, if we may credit old Anthony Wood, however they had no "school" of their own, distinct from the University. The "halls"—*aulæ*—were merely houses hired from the citizens by masters approved by the authorities, who acted at once as guardians and private tutors to the students, whom they boarded in their "halls." When Scotus was there, no less than eighty "halls" are said to have been open at Oxford. The manner of living was by no means extravagant in these establishments; the head of the house boarded his students at the rate of twelve-pence a week;¹ the food was plain bread, beer, porridge, and flesh-meat rarely. The principal himself lived in the largest room, which served as his class-hall, study, and kitchen; nor did the master think it beneath him on some occasions to teach his class and cook his dinner simultaneously.

The "schools" were the regular lecture halls in the various faculties where the students from the different halls assembled to hear the formal lectures and disputations of the masters. The master or doctor got into his chair, or pulpit, the students crowded round to hear him, for none of them had seats, except perhaps the bachelors. He took his text book, and read the text—in theology always it was the Master of the Sentences—and then explained it to the class at length, sometimes by way of question and answer, and sometimes explaining all himself, which was called a "cursory" lecture. The cursory lectures were more popular with the students, because they were less troublesome; but

¹ This was the maximum, but of course money was much more valuable in those days than at present.

except on rare occasions they were forbidden by the authorities, as less useful for the great majority of the scholars. On the occasion of these cursory lectures the master who expatiated with most subtlety, eloquence, and originality, was sure to attract an immense number of students to his class, which was at once pleasing and profitable, for each student was required to pay lecture fees for each term, and the master was required to collect them from all, whether he was himself rich or poor.

So great was the fame of Scotus as a lecturer, that in his time, it is said, there were thirty thousand students in the halls of Oxford. The number is in all probability greatly exaggerated; but the statement is in itself proof of his great fame and success as a Master in the University. From his writings which remain, and which are to a great extent composed of these university prelections, it seems that Scotus taught the entire course at Oxford. That course consisted of the "Seven Arts" and "Three Philosophies" which were the necessary preparation for the professional studies of theology, medicine, and canon law. The first year was given to "Grammar;" the second to "Rhetoric," or the study of the Latin Classics; the third was the "Logic" year—Aristotle's *Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας*, or the *Topics of Boethius* was the class-book; two more years were then given to Arithmetic, Music, Geometry, and Astronomy, or the *Theorica Planctarum*. The "Three Philosophies" followed. Natural Philosophy, *Aristotle's Physics*; Moral Philosophy, *Aristotle's Ethics*, or *Politics*, or *Economics*; and lastly Metaphysical Philosophy, Aristotle's treatise, but all translated into Latin. This was a rather extensive course, and continued for eight years. At its expiration the student *incepted*, that is, took his degree in arts, which consisted chiefly in a public testimony, signed by fourteen masters, that the candidate was worthy of his degree in point of knowledge, morals, and *stature*—*statura*; secondly, he was required to feast the masters, and give most of them a new suit of robes—even Scotus, the poor Franciscan had to do this or forfeit ten marks; lastly, he gave proof of his knowledge and fitness for becoming a master himself by holding a public disputation on certain

subjects against all comers. The *quodlibets* of Scotus, which make up the last volume of his works, are merely an expansion of the theses he maintained, and the course he taught after taking his degree, and get their name from the fact that he was prepared to discuss any of them—*quodlibet*—with any disputant who chose to enter the lists. After completing his course in arts, the student spent seven years more before he was admitted to the Doctorate or Mastership in Theology.

All these Statutes of Oxford were borrowed from the still more famous Paris University; and thither we must now accompany our friend Scotus, who had already far surpassed all his rivals in Oxford.

The great University of Paris was an older and far more celebrated institution than Oxford. No man was considered to have received a finished education, who had not graduated at Paris. Almost all the great doctors of the Mediæval Church received their education there; it was in fact a university for all the nations in Europe. Its origin is said to date from Charlemagne, but certainly not as a university in our sense of the word. He founded the "Palace School," which under the rectorship of Scotus Erigena (850-878) and Remigius (890), assumed a more public character. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries William of Champeaux, and his famous disciple Peter Abilard, and Peter Lombard, the Great Master of the Sentences, rendered the schools of Paris celebrated throughout all Europe. But it was in the year 1200, by a diploma of Philip Augustus, that it was formally constituted a university with large rights and privileges, and an independent governing body. The Dominicans founded a college there in 1229, and the Minors in the year following. In a short time a bitter feud broke out between the secular clergy of the university and the mendicant friars, especially the Dominicans, or Jacobins, as they were afterwards called. The Seculars were unwilling to allow the Dominicans a second professor of theology in the university: but the Friars appealed to the pope, and the pope, Alexander IV., wrote no less than forty briefs in his endeavours to establish harmony between the contending parties. William de St. Amour was the great champion of the Seculars, and attacked

the Mendicants with great bitterness in numerous writings, complaining of their interference with the secular clergy in preaching, teaching and the administration of the Sacraments. But in the end the Friars won the victory and their two professors held their chairs, not, however, until St. Amour was silenced by the condemnation of his book, and the threatened if not actual excommunication of himself. Henceforward it may be said the two orders had it all their own way; but having vanquished the Seculars they became somewhat jealous of each other. There were great doctors and great saints, incapable of jealousy, on either side, but their followers were not all saints, and rivalry is, at least to some extent, as inevitable amongst religious orders as it is amongst individuals. St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure took their degree together in theology, in Paris, in the year 1255, and lived like brothers, and in death it might be said they were not divided, for both died in 1274, one at the Council of Lyons, the other on his way thither. Yet after their death the Dominican and Franciscan schools of theology insensibly diverged, until the Minors, elate with the great fame of Scotus, set him up after his death as the great rival of St. Thomas, and thus gave origin to the Thomist and Scotist Schools. There can be little doubt, therefore, that Scotus, whose great reputation in Oxford had reached the ears of his Provincial, was sent over to Paris to sustain the character of the theological school of the Minors in that city.

The year is not ascertained exactly, but he was certainly there in 1304; for we have the letter of the Minister-General, Gondisalvus, addressed to the Guardian at Paris, authorising Scotus to proceed to take his degree of Bachelor of Theology in that city. Scotus was already Doctor in Theology of the Oxford University, but the Paris degree was held in greater esteem. Hence the General, "informed," as he says, "partly by long experience and partly by fame, of the laudable life, excellent knowledge, and most subtle intellect of his beloved Father in Christ, John Scotus," authorises him to take the said degree, which, however, he hopes will be done with as little expense as possible.

Scotus was now free to lecture in divinity, and he very soon considerably astonished the Parisians : " Primum locum in Schola Parisiensi assecutus ; Academiam illam multum illustravit." He bore away the palm from all Seculars and Regulars, Dominicans and Minors. He took his degree of Doctor in 1307, and the same year was made Regent of his own College of the Cordeliers. It was on this occasion that he held the famous disputation in defence of the Immaculate Conception which has added so much lustre to his name and to his Order.

Some writers say it was to defend this doctrine against the Dominican theologians that he came from Oxford to Paris. It is certain, that at this time the discussions of the two Schools on this great question caused considerable excitement in the university, and the Papal Legate was authorised, in order to settle the matter, to hold a solemn discussion before the university. The Dominicans put up their ablest champions, and they left no possible shadow of argument or objection, from any source, which they did not put forward in defence of their own opinion and against the Franciscan teaching. When they had finished, Scotus got up, and single-handed, from memory alone, it is said, took up every single one of the 200 arguments and objections which they had put forward, refuting them all, and establishing the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception so conclusively that the university, by a solemn act, crowned him with the title of the " Doctor Subtilis," and required all their graduates in theology and canon law to swear solemnly, before admission, that they would always hold and teach that doctrine, and, furthermore, required one of their doctors to preach a Latin sermon every year, before the university, on the feast of Mary Immaculate. Thus it may be said that it was Duns Scotus who gave the *coup de grâce* to the gainsayers of the Immaculate Conception, for that was done, at least as far as the Schools were concerned, when he had convinced the great University of Paris. Ever afterwards they kept the Feast of the Immaculate Conception as a holiday in their schools, and in their Calendar, still existing in MS., for the year 1452, opposite the 8th of December may be read the

words, "Festum B. Mariæ Immaculatae. Hodie in Scholis non legitur."

It is said that when he was a novice Scotus was by no means a brilliant student, and that one day, sitting under a tree in deep dejection at his own dulness, he besought the Blessed Virgin to enlighten the darkness of his mind. Mary appeared to him in a dream, and promised him knowledge and eloquence on condition of using them in her service when they were needed. The story bears evidence of being a clumsy imitation of a similar tale which is told of another great theologian, but if the compact were really made, it was certainly well kept by both. Another tale records that when Scotus was going to the place of this great discussion, on his way he came on a marble statue of the Blessed Virgin, and kneeling down before it for a moment he implored her assistance in the ordeal he had to go through. "The statue bowed its head in answer to the prayer, and it is," says Luke Wadding, "a common tradition in Paris, that the same statue, even to this present day, bows the head responsive to the prayers of the faithful." It is a thing in which we may glory, that it was a son of Ireland whose keen intellect and eloquent tongue first proved to conviction before the scholars of Europe the stainless purity of our Queenly Mother.

Next year Scotus went to Cologne. We can only conjecture the causes which induced the Minister-General to send him thither, but we know how promptly he obeyed the call of duty. He was walking, with some of the students who attended his lectures, in the *Pré aux Clercs*, or college meadows, near Paris, when the letter of his Superior was handed to him. He broke the seal and read the order; then turning to his companions he bade them farewell, saying that he was going to Cologne. "What!" said they, "you are surely not setting off at once, without returning to the Convent, and bidding farewell to your friends, and bringing your books?" But he only said, "my Father Superior bids me go to Cologne, he does not bid me return to Paris, or see my friends, or look after my books." And to Cologne he turned his steps on the spot, like a true son of St. Francis, walking on foot it would seem, perhaps begging alms for himself and

his companions on the journey. But when the great Doctor came near the city, the magistrates and clergy and people informed of his near arrival, went out to meet him and conducted him in solemn procession to his Convent, as the ancient Romans accompanied a victorious general entering the city in triumph. They were fully sensible of the great honour done them by sending the most famous doctor in Paris to teach in their city, and they showed it by the welcome which they accorded him.

Several reasons are assigned by Luke Wadding for the removal of Scotus from Paris to Cologne. Perhaps the chief reason that influenced the Minister-General was a desire to found a great Franciscan school in the city by the Rhine. It was not indeed then, nor for many years after, a regular university city, although it was famous for its great theological school, in which Albertus Magnus had taught, and St. Thomas had learnt. But Albertus had died some years before, and although he left distinguished disciples, there was none of them qualified to fill his place in public estimation. The divinity reader of the Minors, too, had died a short time previously ; so that, if the Minister-General wished to exalt the Franciscan School of Cologne, now was his time. He had only to send the great Scotus and they would be sure to carry all before them. It is said, too, that the citizens, anxious to have a university founded in their city, petitioned the Minister-General to send Scotus to Cologne as the surest means of attracting a large number of students, and thereby strengthening their own claim for a charter from the Pope and Emperor. The heretics known as Beguins or Beggards, were at this time giving great trouble in the Rhenish Provinces, and even went so far as to interrupt the preachers in the pulpits, and challenge them to controversy, not without a certain degree of sympathy from the simple people, whom the assumed austerity of their lives blinded to their faults. But it was expected that a preacher and teacher like Scotus would soon refute their errors efficaciously and destroy their influence. It was very probably, not one alone but all these reasons which induced the Minister-General to remove Scotus from Paris to Cologne.

But his brief and brilliant career was now drawing to a close. No doubt his active mind overworked his weakly body, worn out by study, labour, and mortification. However he persevered to the end, and either fainted or died in the pulpit in the midst of a lecture. The circumstances are not authenticated, but all point to a rather sudden death, probably from heart disease, in the midst of his labours.

"Scotus in objectis ultima verba dedit," says an old writer in one of the many epitaphs on his tomb. But the man who at the call of duty left Paris, without calling to see the friends even of his own house, was always prepared to die, and one could not wish him a nobler end than to die as he had lived, in extending the knowledge of God, of His laws, and of His creatures. He is not to be regarded as proud of his knowledge, or fond of disputation for its own sake. His humility and modesty are especially remarkable; even in advancing those opinions which he held with most sincerity, he always speaks with modesty and even sometimes with diffidence, not however the diffidence of doubt, but of true humility. He is set up as the great rival of St. Thomas, but he never mentions his name, and most certainly these two great writers agreed on many points on which Scotists and Thomists vehemently contend.

One thing is clear, that Scotus loved the Blessed Virgin Mary with the genuine warmth of an Irish heart. He devoted with marvellous success the energies of his unrivalled intellect to vindicate the Immaculate Conception; we may venture to hope that Mary crowned him in heaven even as he strove to weave for her the lily-crown of perfect holiness while he was on earth. Slightly changing a stanza of one of the poems—the "Voices from the Heart"—written by Mary Alphonsus Downing, we can truly say of Scotus—

" 'Twas his to prove how Erin's love
Nor time nor change can vary,
'Twas his to write in lines of light
The royal name of Mary."

They buried him first at the entrance to the sacristy near the Altar of the Three Kings, but as his fame widened and deepened, they transferred the holy remains to the centre of the choir, near the high altar. In the year 1513 the grave

was again opened, and they built him a still grander monument of brass, slightly raised from the level of the floor. A figure of Scotus is wrought in relief on the slab, holding a book in his hands ; at the foot are two couchant lions ; on the right and left are inscribed the names of the great doctors of the Franciscan family, as if crowding round the mighty master ; at its head, are the names and arms of three popes, who, up to that time had come from the same great order. It is a fitting memorial to the memory of the dead, but he needs no monument of brass, his writings will long outlive the bronze and marble, and his memory will be in benediction not only amongst the children of St. Francis, but in the hearts of his countrymen for ages yet unborn.

We shall now examine the writings of Scotus with a view to ascertain not only the place he held in the Schools of Theology, but also the characteristic principles of his system, as well as the influence of his teaching in the development of the Sacred Sciences. This, however, we can do only very briefly and in mere outline.

In order to understand Duns Scotus it is first necessary to sketch the history of Scholastic Theology before his time. Scotus Erigena, who flourished in the ninth century, is generally and justly regarded as the precursor both of Scholastic and Mystic Theology. These two branches of Sacred Science are indeed very different—the theology of the *intellect* which strives to ascertain truth by ratiocination, and the theology of the *will* which strives to reach God by contemplation—yet to the erratic Scotus we owe the origin of both. “ He was,” says Alzog, “ the first man in the West, and the only one in any country for three centuries, who, travelling beyond the traditionary limits of logic and dialectics, built up a strictly coherent system of metaphysics.” Elsewhere he is described as “ the forerunner of the Mysticism of the Schoolmen, or the union of contemplative piety with scientific theology, and led off in the controversy on Universals.” His method, aims, and objects, were altogether different from those of the Positive School who preceded him. In the exposition of doctrine and the refutation of error they, for the most part, appealed to the authority of Sacred Scripture and

the testimony of the Fathers ; they wrote in a loose rhetorical style ; they spurned dialectics, and eschewed philosophy. Not so Scotus, and the new School of which he is the primal type. He was by nature a logician, by study and inclination a Neo-Platonist ; he combined dialectical accuracy with brilliancy of exposition, but, trusting too much to his genius in his bold and original speculations, he brought upon himself the anger of his contemporaries as well as the censures of the Church. But the seed was sown and produced its fruit, whether good or bad, in due season.

The real origin of Scholasticism ¹ dates from the middle of the eleventh century, and must be traced to the famous dispute between the Nominalists and Realists regarding the nature of Universals. This question was not, as is sometimes supposed, discussed by Aristotle himself. It was raised however, by Porphyry in his Introduction to the Categories, but not answered till Boethius attempted a solution, tending however rather to the Nominalist than to the Realist view. In the eleventh century ² the question for the first time began to assume a doctrinal importance. The arch-heretic Berengarius, who appealed to Scotus Erigena as his authority, accepting the Nominalist view of the essential and absolute unity of the individual body, and consequently the absolute impossibility of separating the substance from the accidents, denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Lanfranc refuted Berengarius, not only on authority as a positive theologian, but also by maintaining the distinction between substance and accident, which the other had ignored. Hitherto, however, the Nominalist doctrine had not been formulated ; but now the famous John Roscelin, canon of Compiègne, appears upon the scene, and declares that Universals have no objective reality, that they are mere words, *flatus vocis*, and boldly applying his principles even to the doctrine of the Trinity

¹ A "Scholasticus" meant in Rome a teacher of a rhetorical school ; in the middle ages it meant the head-master of a school of philosophy or theology ; hence the name *Scholastic*.

² "Quo tempore verisimile est primum in Scholis monasteriorum auditas esse controversias Nominalium et Realium."—*Brucker*.

"Occasione vero numerice disputationum et altercationum Berengarianarum ortae sunt in Academia Parisiensi duae sectae philosophorum, Nominalistarum et Realistarum."—*Du Boulay*.

denied not the distinction of the Persons, but rather the unity of the Divine Essence : his system inevitably led him either to one or the other extreme. The discussion now waxed warm ; the monastic schools were thrown into commotion ; Roscelin was attacked from every quarter but stoutly defended himself, and even ventured to appeal in support of his opinion to the writings of Anselm, who was just then preparing to cross over into England in order to take possession of the See of Canterbury. Anselm, justly indignant at the audacity of Roscelin, emphatically disavowed the imputation, and wrote his famous treatise *De Fide Trinitatis* against the "blasphemies" of Roscelin, in which he clearly and effectively refutes the Nominalist view, leaning however, as some think, too much to the Realist opinions. Anselm's theory was approved of in the Council of Soissons held in 1092, and Roscelin was ordered to retreat. From this controversy many persons date the origin of Scholastic Philosophy and Theology. After the death¹ of Anselm, William of Champeaux who is regarded as the first professor of the new theology in Paris, took up the gauntlet on the same side. But he went much further than St. Anselm, and maintained the objective existence of the Universals, quite independent of all the individuals which belong to the species. The Realists, absurd as it may now seem to us, appear to have been gaining ground in the Schools, when Peter Abelard came to the rescue of their opponents. He was a disciple first of Roscelin, and afterwards of William of Champeaux, so that he had the exceptional advantage of knowing the strong and weak points of both the contending parties. He was naturally a man of quick parts, both eloquent and keen witted, and he loved dialectics as he loved his own soul. He was never easy except when he was wrangling ; and his foremost delight was to set up in opposition to his teachers and draw away their pupils. Abelard was a far abler metaphysician than either Roscelin or William of Champeaux. He attacked them in turn, although himself inclined to be a Nominalist, and, it must be confessed, utterly

¹ Anselm as a philosopher preceded William of Champeaux by about twenty years. William died in 1121, Anselm in 1109, Lanfranc in 1089. Dupin dates the first period of Scholasticism from Anselm to Albert the Great.

demolished them by a series of arguments which are admirable specimens of close and cogent reasoning, seasoned here and there with sarcasm, irony, and wit.

But Abelard was not content with his fame in metaphysics ; he must rashly venture into the domain of theology. He himself admits¹ that he was but little versed in Sacred Scripture and Patristic learning, and, as might naturally be expected from such a combination of pride and ignorance, he soon came to grief. He undertook to expound, in his *Theologia Christiana*, the greatest of all mysteries—the mystery of the Holy Trinity—according to his own peculiar metaphysical principles. He was accused of introducing degrees, *gradus*, between the Persons of the Trinity, by limiting the Omnipotence of the Son, and denying the Consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost. His writings were carried to St. Bernard, who asked him to retract his errors. Abelard refused to admit himself in error, and challenged the Saint to a discussion in the Council of Sens in 1140. Saint Bernard was at first reluctant to engage with so renowned a disputant, yet yielding at length in the interests of truth, he went to the Council and demolished Abelard (who had not the courage to meet him), as completely as Abelard had demolished William of Champeaux. It was the final conflict between the Old and the New Schools ; St. Bernard was the last of the Fathers, and Abelard may be regarded as the first of the Schoolmen, of whose wordy wars the Saint speaks with anger and contempt. In a letter to Innocent II. he bitterly censures the presumption of Abelard, who from his boyhood, he says, trifled in dialectics, and now plays the fool in theology.² But when St. Bernard was laid in the vault of Clairvaux, the Old Theology was buried

¹ He went to Laon to study theology under Anselm, a professor in that city, but he undertook while still, as he admits, "lectionis expertus" to teach it himself, and with so much success that he drew all the students from his master. Elsewhere he says, "pride, not ignorance, is the root of heresy." But although he led a somewhat erratic life, both in theory and practice, he was no heretic ; and we know from the Venerable Peter of Cluny, that he died a holy death in a convent of that Order. "It has not been my fortune," he said of Abelard, "to meet a more humble man than he." He died at Chalons, on the Saone, on the 21st April, 1142.

² "Habemus nunc in Francia novum de veteri magistro theologum qui et ineunte aetate in arte dialectica lusit, et nunc in Scripturis Sacris insanit."—*Litterae ad Innoc.*

along with him, and the New School grew by degrees in strength and pride, trusting perhaps at times too much to reason and Aristotle, and too little to authority, but rich in the promise, which was not falsified, of a glorious future both for philosophy and theology.¹

Du Boulay, in his *History of the University of Paris*, divides Scholasticism into three periods : the first from Lanfranc (or according to others from Abelard) to Albert the Great, the second from Albert the Great to Durandus, the third from Durandus to the Renaissance ; which three periods respectively correspond to its rise, glory, and decline. During the first period, from the beginning of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth century, Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, the famous Master of the Sentences, was the central figure. And yet the Master of Scholastics can hardly be regarded as a Scholastic himself. He did a great and necessary work indeed, but it was the work of a theologian of the old Positive School. He saw the errors into which many of the earlier Scholastics—Roscelin, Abelard, Gillebert de la Parrée, as well as many others—had fallen. He saw strife and disunion in the Schools, strange opinions put forward, new subtleties invented, and, fearing lest the doctrines of the Church might suffer in those dangerous times of intellectual revolution, he resolved to collect a body of authentic decisions regarding the more important questions at issue. These decisions were for the most part “sentences,” or passages quoted from Sacred Scripture and from the Latin Fathers, especially from St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine. Hence this great work was called the “Book of the Sentences,” and its author was known as the “Master of the Sentences.” It became the Gospel of the Scholastics ; they never questioned its authority ; and every great teacher undertook to explain its obscurities, or supplement its deficiencies. It is said that

¹ Tunc ergo, ut philosophorum, ita et theologorum plures erant sectae. Una veterum qui fidei dogmata S. Scripturae et SS. Patrum auctoritatibus et argumentis confirmari contenti erant. Altera modernorum (qui et Scholastici dicebantur) et illis regulis Aristotelicis et dialecticis, nimis fortasse plus quam theologos decuisset, confisi plurimas propositiones curiosas et inutiles et ad errorem potius quam ad veritatem inducentes dictitabant et conscribebant.”—Buleus, *His. Univ. Paris* ii.

four thousand commentaries have been written on the Master of the Sentences ; certainly a greater number than any other book except the Bible has had. Hardly a single theologian of eminence can be named in those days, who did not write his " Commentary on the Books of the Sentences ; " the huge and dusty tomes still burden the shelves of all our great libraries. Such was the estimation in which Lombard was held, after the publication of this great work, that Philip, Archdeacon of Paris, the son and brother of a king, although elected by the Chapter of Paris to the bishopric of that city, resigned his place to the friendless stranger whose only claim was his learning. His death on the 20th of July, 1164, marks an epoch in the history of theology.

Another noteworthy fact is the scant acquaintance with Aristotle enjoyed by those early Scholastics. They were acquainted, through wretched Latin translations, with portions of the *Organon*, or logical writings of Aristotle ; but they knew nothing of his *Physics* or *Metaphysics*. We have on this point the express testimony of Abelard,¹ who says that in his time there were in all only seven treatises on logic in the Schools, and these written in Latin : two of Aristotle, *The Categories*, and the treatise *Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας* ; Porphyry's *Introduction*, and four of Boethius—*De Divisione*, *De Differentiis Topicis*, *De Syllogismo Categorico*, and *De Hypothetico*. It was with these scanty materials the early Scholastics constructed their ingenious theories. Abelard himself knew Greek ; in his letters to Heloise, he exhorts her and her nuns to the study of both Greek and Hebrew, which may be regarded as a sufficient proof of his own acquaintance with these languages. But hitherto they had no Greek copies of any portion of Aristotle's works in the Schools of the West ; and hence even the few persons then acquainted with Greek had no opportunity of consulting the original works of the " Philosopher." But that defect was soon to be remedied.

¹ " Septem codicibus omnis in hac arte eloquentia Latina armatur. Aristotelis enim duos tantum *Prædicamentorum* scil. et *Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας* libros usus adhuc Latinorum cognovit ; Porphyrii vero unum Boethii autem quatuor, vid. *Divisionum* et *Topicorum*, cum *Syllogismis tam Categoricis quam Hypotheticis*."—*Œuvres Inédites*, fol. 132.

The thirteenth century, perhaps the most interesting in the history of the human mind, as it certainly is in the history of the Church—the century of great Popes, great Orders, great theologians, and great cathedrals, opens with three remarkable events, the incorporation of the University of Paris, the foundation of the two Orders of Dominicans and Franciscans, and the introduction into Western Europe of the principal works of Aristotle. Each of these events gave a new impulse to the literary activity of the age.

It was in the year 1200 that Philip Augustus formally constituted the great school of Paris a “*Studium Generale* ;” and bestowed so many franchises and privileges on both masters and scholars, that this university in a short time included sixty-eight colleges, and became the seminary for all European nations.

In 1204 Constantinople was taken by the Latins, and a Latin Kingdom established at Jerusalem. The frequent intercourse thus established between the East and West contributed much to the literary culture of the latter. The victorious Crusaders, amongst other literary treasures, brought home copies of the *Physics* and the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle. About the same time they received better Latin translations, and fuller commentaries on most of the writings of the Stagirite from another source. The Arabians, under the dynasty of the Abbassides, had acquired a great taste for the arts and sciences ; through the Nestorian Christians, whom they patronized, they became acquainted with the works of Aristotle. Avicenna (1036) in Bagdad, and later on (1198) Averrhoes, in the beautiful city of Cordova, promoted the study of the Aristotelian philosophy by free translations into Arabic of the principal writings of the Stagirite. These were re-translated into Latin, and through the agency of Spanish Christians, and Jewish merchants from Montpellier and other cities, they were soon carried into the great university cities of Paris, Oxford, and Cologne. Masters and scholars perused them with the greatest avidity. Heretofore the Stagirite was an authority ; now he became an oracle. The bishops were alarmed ; the

Physics of Aristotle especially contained many errors, and they feared the doctrine taught by these new lights. Councils were convened, and many stringent prohibitions against the reading of the Physics and Metaphysics were issued. In 1209, a Council held in Paris ordered the Metaphysics to be burnt, because they caused heresy in the past, and were likely to do so in the future also. In 1215, the legate of the large-minded Innocent III. forbade the study of the Physics or Metaphysics under penalty of excommunication; and even so late as 1231, Gregory IX. prohibited the reading of the Physics until they were purged of their errors.¹ Yet all these severe enactments were in vain, and we find both saints and scholars writing commentaries and making new translations of the forbidden books.

It was just at this very time, when the leaven of the Aristotelian philosophy was fermenting in the intellect of the Schools, that the two new Orders, the Dominicans and the Franciscans, were founded. They had both established themselves at Paris so early as the year 1218, and at once came to the front in the university. To teach and preach was the primary duty of the sons of St. Dominick, and the Minors were their rivals in the discharge of that high duty. In 1221 Albert the Great joined the Friars Preachers in Paris; the next year Alexander De Hales, a no less distinguished theologian, entered the Order of St. Francis in the same city. Thus, from the very beginning, the two new Orders entered into a silent and holy rivalry in the cause of sacred science. Albertus was the teacher of St. Thomas, and although it is not expressly stated, we may fairly assume that Bonaventure was a pupil of his great rival, Alexander De Hales, the Irrefragable Doctor. It has been said by many writers, that Scotus, too, studied under the same master; but, as Luke Wadding remarks, the facts of chronology cannot be reconciled with this statement. De Hales had died at Paris in 1245, some years before Scotus was born. But the history of the times naturally led up to a rivalry in theology between the two great Orders, and

¹ See Lanoius *De varia Aristotelis in Academia Parisiensi fortuna*. Tom. iv. cap. i.

this rivalry was productive of the very greatest advantage for the cultivation of the sacred sciences.

We now find the two Schools face to face in the university cities towards the close of the thirteenth century: St. Thomas being the leader of the Dominicans, and Scotus the head of the Franciscans. Here we may observe that it is impossible to understand Scotus without a knowledge of St. Thomas, and impossible to understand St. Thomas, if we know nothing of Aristotle. He was the common master of both; both were familiar with his philosophy in all its branches, and wrote extensive commentaries on the works of Aristotle.

These works, as we have already intimated, may for our purposes be sub-divided into four classes. First, we have the "Logical Treatises," including under the general name of the "Organon" in the *Categories*, the treatise on propositions called *Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας*, the four books of the *First and Second Analytics*, the eight books on the *Topics*, or sources of probable knowledge, and lastly the treatise on *Sophisms*. With these Aristotelian works, the Scholastics from the beginning were all perfectly familiar.

The second class includes Aristotle's treatises on speculative philosophy, namely his *Physics* in eight books, to which may be referred his smaller works, *On Heaven*, *On Production and Destruction*, *On Meteorology*, *On the Universe*, and *On the Soul*.

The *Metaphysics*, in fourteen books, treats of all those great questions which are now generally included under the term, and are too well known to need recapitulation here.

The *Mathematics* regards the two attributes of matter, quantity and extension; and contains some of Aristotle's peculiar views relative to the laws of motion. This treatise was not much studied in the Middle Ages.

The third class includes three treatises on practical philosophy: the *Ethics*, in ten books, with some smaller treatises on the same subject; the *Politics*, in eight books; and the *Economics*, in two books, of which the second is considered spurious.

Leaving out of consideration Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*, the immense treatises on natural history, and his

numerous miscellaneous writings, it will be seen that the Scholastics had a sufficiently large field of labour in the investigation of all the problems raised by the mighty mind of the Stagirite. Of the twenty-one folio volumes which contain the works of Albert the Great in the Lyons edition of 1651, the first six are devoted to commentaries on the logical and physical writings of Aristotle. From his master, Albert, St. Thomas inherited the greatest admiration for the Peripatetic philosophy in all its branches. Aristotle had given a *rationale* of the whole natural world, a complete and scientific exposition of every branch of human knowledge. St. Thomas had a mind framed in a similar mould, he loved order, he traced it in all things, and he grouped the branches of supernatural knowledge into one harmonious whole. On the lines traced out by the genius of the Greek philosopher, he built up in his *Summa*, with materials furnished by reason and revelation, the noblest and most enduring scientific edifice ever constructed by the mind of man. The works of St. Thomas are contained in seventeen folio volumes; of these, as in the case of his master, Albert, the first five contain his commentaries on Aristotle, certainly the best and most exhaustive hitherto written. Besides, with the aid of the monk William of Moerbeek, he prepared a new Latin translation of most of the writings of the "Philosopher" after the Greek originals. This is known as the *Vetus Translatio*, and its admitted accuracy in the most minute particulars places it on a level with the very best original MSS. in the estimation of critics.

Of course Scotus too followed the example of those who had gone before him, and wrote his commentaries on Aristotle and an exposition of the Master of the Sentences. He simply wrote what he had taught in his lectures at Oxford and Paris, and that course of lectures included all the philosophy and theology then read in the Schools. His first treatise is what he calls a *Grammatica Speculativa seu de Modis Significandi*, and was published at Venice in 1499. By some writers this work is attributed to Albert of Saxony; unjustly, however, for it bears unmistakable signs of the acute genius of Scotus. It is a treatise preparatory to the study of logic, in which he undertakes to explain the "*genuinam vim verborum, et*

veram sermonis proprietatem, et veram vocum etymologiam, quae adhiberi solent in logica et metaphysica.”

This was preparatory to his treatises on Logic, Physics, and Metaphysics. After these we have the *Meteora*, a work in which the author expounds, along with some new views of his own, the Mathematics, Astrology, and Optics of Aristotle. He discusses, in a fashion which would considerably astonish our modern physicists, the nature of the sun and moon, of the tides, of rain, hail, and snow, of thunder, lightning, and earthquakes, those questions which ancient Philosophy so longed and tried in vain to solve :—

“ Me vero primum dulces ante omnia Masae
Quarum sacra fero ingenti percussus amore
Accipiant, coelique vias et sidera monstrent,
Unde tremor terris ; qua vi maria alta tumescant,
Objicibus ruptis, rurusque in se ipsa residant,
Quid tantum oceano properent se tingere soles
Hiberni, vel quae tardis mora noctibus obstet.”—*Virg., Georg.*

In the treatises *De Rerum Principio* et *De Primo Principio*, we have his cosmology, and the foundation of his peculiar metaphysical system. Lastly, we have his commentary in twelve books on the Aristotelian Metaphysics, in which he goes over all the ground covered by St. Thomas and by Aristotle, submitting every statement made by either to the keen analysis of a mind that in subtlety, at least, is almost universally admitted to be superior to either. It is in this work that he lays down those metaphysical principles of his own, which profoundly modified both the philosophy and theology of the Middle Ages.

In theology proper he wrote two distinct commentaries on the Master of the Sentences, the first at Oxford, which is the fullest and best of the commentaries on Peter Lombard, if we except St. Thomas alone. The authenticity of the second treatise, usually called the *Reportata*, has been called in question. It is probably a recast of the larger work, with additions by a disciple of Scotus, incorrectly attributed to the master himself. Besides the *Questiones Quodlibetales*, of which we have spoken, he also wrote several smaller theological works, considerable commentaries on the Gospels and Epistles of Saint Paul, as well as a collection of sermons

on many of the Saints and Feasts of the Church. The entire writings of Scotus, with commentaries by Lychettus, were published at Lyons, in twelve folio volumes by Luke Wadding in the year 1639. Portions of his writings, too, have been separately published at various times and in various places.

Although Duns Scotus walked in the path of his predecessors, at least as far as his method is concerned, he was in other respects by no means either a servile imitator or obsequious disciple. He had the courage of his opinions, and boldly attacked the fundamental principle both of St. Thomas and Aristotle, namely the doctrine of *primal matter* and *substantial forms*. He dared not, indeed, nor did he wish to reject this doctrine of matter and form, as a whole, but he maintained that their analysis was defective and unsatisfactory, and consequently inadequate to explain the nature of individual being. The Aristotelian system undertakes to furnish a *rationale* of the whole universe of mind and matter; its fundamental principle is this theory of matter and form, which St. Thomas carries into theology, applying it to the physical and moral world, to the natural and supernatural, to the Sacraments as well as to man and the visible universe. When Scotus attacked them in this principle, one can easily see how far-reaching were the consequences of his assault against the very citadel of human knowledge. Aristotle began with external objects, he submits them one by one to observation and analysis, and he finds everywhere unity in variety. Earth becomes wood, wood becomes coal, coal becomes fire; plants become food, the food is changed into blood, the blood again into flesh and bone and sinew; the flesh in its turn moulders into clay to become new food for plants and animals. So the ever-changing cycle rolls, nothing is created, nothing is lost. But in all these things there is an element that always remains, and an element that always changes. The former is the *ἕλη*, the *materia prima*, a passive element, an incomplete substance, in a state of mere potentiality, indifferent to all forms of being, capable of receiving any, and always necessarily united to some one in particular. This primal matter is essentially one and simple and incorruptible, incapable of generation, and, according to

Aristotle, eternal ; in which last point alone he was contradicted by St. Thomas.

On the other hand there is in all bodies an (εἶδος), or *forma substantialis*, not therefore a mere accident or outward shape (μόρφη), but a formative principle, which gives to matter actuality (ἐνέργεια) determination, and the completeness of perfect being (ἐντελέχεια). St. Thomas accepts this analysis as a complete explanation of the essence of beings both *in specie* and *in individuo*. Here it is precisely that Scotus joins issue, and declares that the principle of individuation cannot be found either in matter, or in form, or in both. Peter, he says, is not James ; yet both Peter and James have specifically the same human nature, therefore the same matter and form of human nature, therefore they are not individuated by either matter or form, or by the union of both. Neither can any or all the accidental qualities in a man be the principle of his individuation, for they may be changed one and all, and in progress of time indeed are changed one and all, yet the individual remains the same ; therefore the principal of his individuation and identity remains the same, and consequently does not consist in changing accidents, but like the matter and form must belong in some sense to the essence of the man. In what then does principle of individuation consist ? The question was answered in many different ways. It is the form that gives individuality, said Abelard ; it is the matter, said Albertus Magnus ; St. Thomas placed it in the *materia signata*, which expression has been variously explained by his disciples. Henri de Gand declared it was a pure negation, the negation of actual union or the exigence of actual union with any other being. Scotus rejects all these solutions of the question, and says this principle of individuation or subsistence is a *modus substantialis* which he calls *haecceity*, superadded to both matter and form, making Peter an individual, a person, and differentiating him from James and from every other human being in existence. It is not our purpose to criticise but to endeavour to explain the characteristic principles of the Scotist doctrine, and this principle of *haecceitas* was undoubtedly the most important of them all in itself, and the most pregnant in its consequences.

We may incidentally observe, that although this doctrine of matter and form has been ridiculed and assailed by many philosophers, who know very little about it, and is now generally regarded as an altogether exploded system, yet it offers quite as satisfactory a solution of the nature of bodies, and one as much in accordance with the known facts of modern science, as any other theory formulated by Descartes, Leibnitz, Locke, or Huxley. For after all, what is this *primal matter* in the Scholastic philosophy? It is simply a convenient name for the aggregate of atoms, monads, or elements, of which chemical analysis goes to prove that bodies are composed. And what is the *form* but the aggregate of the forces, the sum total of the energies of these atoms, which taken together, atoms and energies, make up material substances? Aristotle says that the form is the energizing principle, and *energy* is quite as good a word as *force*. We may add that the Scholastic idea of the essential unity of *matter* is strongly borne out by the opinion of those scientists who hold that all bodies will, in ultimate analysis, be found to be composed of homogeneous atoms, if chemists can ever procure heat sufficiently intense to affect the resolution of those substances which are now considered simple elements.

That the opinion of Scotus on the principle of individuation was preferred by contemporary scholars to that of St. Thomas was shown in a very significant way. If, said Scotus, *materia signata* be the principle of individuation, how will disembodied spirits be individualized, when there is no matter to give determination to the form—the human soul? How are the angels to be individually distinguished, who have the same angelic nature, or will it become necessary to hold that no two angels can belong to the same species?—a proposition that seems to have been maintained by St. Thomas. At least his teaching on this point had, even during his lifetime, caused great excitement both at Oxford and Paris. The Franciscans were strong at Oxford, and pretended to be greatly scandalized at the assertion that each *species angelica* was composed of a single angel, the whole University was in commotion, the theological faculty assembled, and after a stormy discussion the proposition was condemned. The dispute was then

revived in Paris. Ægidius Colonna was a strong and earnest Thomist, and defended the teaching of his master with vigour, still the proposition was condemned by the University and the Bishop of Paris in the year 1278.¹ It was maliciously added to the condemnation that it was "*contra fratrem Thomam*" which shows the bitter spirit that inspired the victorious party. When, however, St. Thomas was canonized these words were expunged, but the condemnation was allowed to remain. These things, however, took place before Scotus became master in the Schools, but decidedly influenced his opinions on this subject. It would far exceed our limits to trace the consequences of this fundamental disagreement between the two Schools. We hasten to note another principle of divergency, which is now very intimately connected with that to which we have already referred. St. Thomas and his entire school teach that there is no *real* distinction of any kind between the Divine essence and the Divine attributes, or between the Divine essence and relations in God. But Scotus, as he held that the principal of individuation or personality in intelligent beings is a *modus* superadded to the matter and form, so he also holds that a distinction which he calls *formalis*, and *formalis ex natura rei*, exists between the Divine nature and the Divine relations. He speaks, indeed, obscurely, for although he asserts that the distinction precedes every act of the created and uncreated intellect, he adds that it is not a real actual distinction in the ordinary sense, and that it may be also called "*differentia rationis*," and a "*differentia virtualis*." St. Thomas is, however, emphatic in asserting the identity of the Divine essence and Divine relations *secundum rem*, and that a distinction exists only "*secundum intelligentiæ rationem*." The latter part of this statement formally contradicts the statement of Scotus, that the distinction precedes every act of the created or uncreated intelligence. Suarez, however, asserts that the doctrine of Scotus is sound in faith, and we may add that it has been accepted by many theologians not only of his

¹ "Error est dicere quod, quia intelligentiæ non habent materiam, Deus non possit plures ejusdem speciei facere. *Contra fratrem Thomam*." Yet the proposition, at least in these words, is, as far as we could ascertain, not in St. Thomas.

own great School, but even by several theologians of name who belonged to neither Thomist nor Scotist School. This *distinctio formalis* seu *modalis* necessarily modified many other opinions of the Scotist School, both in philosophy and theology. The purpose of Scotus in laying down this distinction was to escape from the logical difficulties involved in the Thomist doctrine of the Holy Trinity—"Pater generat, Essentia non generat;" it is not easy to see how these two propositions can be both true, and also the third proposition, *Essentia est Pater*. Scotus then, by his formal distinction between the Paternitas and the Divine Essence, seemed to make the mystery more intelligible; if there were no logical difficulties in the way, there would be no mystery at all in the matter. The warmest discussions of the rival Schools centred round this point, and continued unabated down to the time of Suarez, who virtually declares that both opinions come to the same thing.

Another question raised by these ingenious Scholastics was: is it possible in the future life to have a vision of the Divine Essence, and yet not of the Persons, or to have the vision of one Divine Person, and not of another? St. Thomas declared that it was absolutely impossible; but Scotus held, in accordance with his own principles, that it did not seem by any means to be absolutely impossible. I refer to this discussion only to show how the formal distinction necessarily gave rise to many other points of difference between the two great Schools, as well as the little practical importance of the questions that were sometimes agitated with great warmth between the contending parties.

We now return to the philosophical discussions between Thomists and Scotists.

Aristotle wrote a valuable treatise, *De Anima*, which was in the hands of all the Scholastics. St. Thomas accepts his teaching in psychology without any important modification. Its fundamental principle is enunciated in the famous maxim: "*Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu.*" Even admitting that the axiom, in these words, is not to be found in St. Thomas, the doctrine which it enunciates is certainly there, and widely differs from the materialistic ideology of Locke and Condillac.

According to St. Thomas, the mind is originally a *tabula rasa*, a sheet of white paper ; by the agency of the external senses a *species sensibilis* is impressed on the " internal sense." Thereupon the *intellectus agens* comes into exercise, and spiritualizes the *species sensibilis* into a *species intelligibilis* ; this latter stimulates the *intellectus possibilis* to action ; the *intellectus possibilis* thus stimulated produces thought or conception. By a further process of abstraction and generalization we get the notions of *genus* and *species*, and thus arrive at science. This system, so severely attacked by the Cartesians, describes, at least as accurately as any modern system, the mental procedure in as far as we can clearly trace it. The image (*species impressa*), in the case of vision for instance, is not only drawn but *painted* on the retina of the eye, *sensus internus*. The optic nerve conveys the impression to the brain, and the brain thus stimulated spiritualizes this image into *species intelligibilis*, which in turn produces thought or ideas, from which ideas as before we arrive at the universal, the proper object of science.

Scotus, however, greatly modified, in accordance with his principles on matter and form, this mode of procedure. St. Thomas held the mind to be a *tabula rasa*, not only destitute of ideas, but utterly incapable of acquiring them, except through the senses, and in virtue of the *phantasmata* supplied by the inward sense. How then, said Scotus, do angels, how can separated souls, acquire knowledge ? or are these latter incapable of acquiring any new knowledge of things in a *natural* way ? In their case there can be no *species impressa*, and, therefore, no idea, no knowledge. He holds, consequently, that the Aristotelian maxim must be modified, that the mind can, independently of all sensible impressions, and in virtue of its own intrinsic power, obtain ideas and acquire knowledge, that it does not *necessarily* need either the agency of the senses, or the stimulus of the phantasmata to call it into action. In other words, in the Thomist system a *medium* is necessarily required between the subject and object to stimulate the former to action, because the mind is a pure form, and as such necessarily incomplete ; in the Scotist system no such medium is

necessarily required, because the mind is not a pure form, and therefore not incomplete, but with a potentiality reducible to action, altogether independent of things external. St. Thomas seems to hold that the separated soul can acquire knowledge only in a quasi-angelic, *and to it supernatural*, manner; while Scotus holds that it can and does acquire knowledge in a natural way, because there is in the soul although it is the form of the body, a *potentia et actus*, corresponding to matter and form in material things, which make it a substance sufficiently complete to acquire knowledge in a *natural* way. It is not difficult to see how many pregnant consequences in philosophy and theology follow from this fundamental difference in the ideology of the Thomists and Scotists.

We now come to the peculiar physical system of the Scholastics. It was admitted, as one of the fundamental principles of Scholastic physics, that there is an essential difference between the nature of *sublunary* and *celestial* bodies. The former are gross and corruptible, the latter are ethereal and incorruptible. The natural motion of the sublunary bodies is rectilinear; the natural motion of the celestial bodies on the other hand is curvilinear. On these two principles they built up their entire system of terrestrial and celestial physics.

It was contrary to the very nature of things, for instance, that the earth could move *round* the sun, seeing that its *natural* motion is rectilinear: it could only move in a straight line if it moved at all. The sublunary world is, in their system, composed of four simple elements, fire, air, earth, and water; into these all sublunary bodies are resolvable. Two of them have a *natural* motion upwards, fire and air; and two have a *natural* motion downwards, earth and water. Hence the former have no weight, *summe levia sunt*¹ but the latter have necessarily weight, either *in summo gradu, ut octo*, as they said, or *in gradu inferiori*. To these four elements the four primary qualities correspond,

¹ According to the Scholastics, a body is *light* by nature that has a natural tendency to fly from the centre (the earth), and the body is *heavy* that naturally flies to a centre.

the hot, the cold, the dry, the humid ; the *humid* being the characteristic quality of air, and the *cold* belonging to water. In accordance with the *predominance* of any element and its characteristic quality, they divided men's temperaments into four kinds ; the melancholic, in which the earthly element predominates ; in the phlegmatic it is water ; in the sanguineous it is air ; while in the choleric, fire is the ruling element. In accordance with these principles, and by purely *a priori* reasoning, Scotus gives very ingenious, and to our notions very amusing, explanations of the various natural phenomena that take place in the world around us.

In the first place he makes a marked distinction between "vapours" and "exhalations." The "vapour" is educed from water and other bodies of a *humid* nature by the heat of the sun, and by the virtue of the stars ; and these vapours so generated produce clouds, rain, hail, snow, and dew. On the other hand, "exhalations" are derived from the earthy or dry bodies, by the same solar and stellar influence ; and cause meteors, comets, winds, thunder and lightning. First he discusses the tides and currents of the sea. The sea, he says, is the natural abode of the water : hence it ought to be at rest, if strong external influences did not act upon it, and produce *violent* motion. Two causes produce a current from the north to the south : first, the greater elevation of the north, and water seeks the lowest place ; this indeed can hardly be called a violent motion. Secondly, the north is naturally cold and humid, hence more water is produced there, while the south is hot and dry, and thus evaporates a greater quantity, leaving the vacuum to be filled by currents from the north.

With regard to the tides, he rejects the theory that they are caused by submarine gulfs, which at one time swallow up and afterwards eject vast quantities of water. With the Bishop of Lincoln, he holds that they are caused by the moon : when it is low in the horizon, its slanting rays are weak, and therefore able to raise, but not able to dissipate the vapours of the sea. These vapours cause a swelling or boiling of the mass, and thus we have the flow of the tide. When, however, the moon reaches the meridian,

its rays approach the perpendicular, and thus becoming stronger, are able to dissipate the vapours which they excite, causing thereby a lowering and reflux of the swollen element.¹ That the moon has an influence over the sea, which is a humid element, cannot be questioned, seeing that it exercises a similar sway over the brain, marrow, blood and humours of the human body, as experience, he adds, abundantly testifies.

In explaining the causes of earthquakes, he says that there are within the earth immense caverns whence rivers and fountains flow. The solar and stellar heat generates in these caverns great quantities of humid "vapour"; in cold weather the vapours are condensed; when more moisture gains admittance, with the returning heats, the new as well as the old moisture is converted into vapour of very high pressure. This vapour, in its efforts to escape, shakes the earth until at length it finds a safety valve by bursting violently through its prison walls.

Thunder, according to Scotus, is caused by "exhalations" which the solar heat educes from earthy and dry bodies. These exhalations being thus by nature dry and warm, seek the higher regions; in their upward course they meet with watery clouds, which being of an opposite nature surround and imprison them. In their efforts to escape the pressure of the clouds, they make loud rumblings, striking against the "sides" of the opposing clouds, until at length they break through with the loud explosion, or thunder clap, which resounds in our ears. The lightning is simply the flash of light generated by the high pressure and rapid motion of the escaping "exhalation;" it is only instantaneous, however, as the exhalation is at once diffused when the pressure is removed.² Comets are the same exhalations in still higher regions of the heavens, lit up by rapid motion and reflected light.

It is not at all a matter of surprise if these ingenious theories found ready acceptance in the minds of men, who unheritatingly admitted as physical axioms the doctrine of the four

¹ *De Meteoris*, Lib. ii. quaest. ii. art. 2.

² *De Meteoris*, Lib. ii. quaest. 8.

elements, primary qualities, and natural motions on which they are founded.

We can only say very few words about the beautiful but unreal system of the heavens, which the scholastics accepted from Aristotle and Ptolemy. We refer to it chiefly in order to point out in what respect Scotus and his School rejected and refuted the generally received doctrine of the Scholastics, and at the same time made the first step in the road that led to the brilliant discoveries of Copernicus, Newton, and Laplace.

This theory of Aristotle, and of the Scholastics generally, established the doctrine of incorruptible heavens, a region of beauty, serenity, and repose. It was the most perfect work of God in the natural order, not like the sublunary world, a mixture of the baser elements in various proportions ; it was exclusively composed of a fifth element, not indeed, immaterial, but pure, simple and unchanging with a nature and a motion of its own, and by God's design expressing an influence of its own over all sublunary beings, animate and inanimate.¹ In one respect only, where faith compelled them, did the Scholastics disagree with Aristotle. He taught that, at least the upper orb, the first heaven, was eternal like God himself. He was the first *immovable mover*, but the heavens were the first *movable mover*, moved itself by God, and moving in turn the inferior universe, with which the principal and purely Spiritual Being could not be brought into immediate contact. The eternity of the heavens the Scholastics rejected, but its incorruptibility and influence over the inferior world they unanimously admitted. Hence the inevitable tendency of the age to judicial astrology,² to the

¹ In answer to the question " Utrum stella comata significet mortem principum ? " Scotus answers affirmatively from the authority of Albertus Magnus, and all astrologers, that is, all astronomers, and the reason is : " Stella comata signat universaliter mortalitates et epidemica omnium venientium super terram, potius dicitur signare mortem principum, quia magis notatur quam aliorum."—*De Meteoris, Lib. i. quaest. 19, art. 2.*

² " Verum est tamen quod corpus coeleste agit in voluntatem nostram quasdam inclinationes, mediantibus quibus facilitatur aut difficitatur in operando. Unde sapiens astrologus multa mala prohibere potest quae secundum stellas essent ventura et juvat opus stellarum sicut seminator vires herbarum."—*De Meteoris, Lib. i. quaest. 3, art. 3.*

admission of this all-pervading, but not always inevitable, influence exercised by the stars and planets over the tangled web of human destiny. It was not by any means the blind inevitable fate of the ancients, superior to Jove himself, but a secondary causality, created by Divine power, the subject and the instrument of the designs of an all-ruling Providence. It was a beautiful, and, in what we should now call an unscientific age, a not unnatural theory. These nine encircling heavens encompassed the earth all round ; they were the fountains of light and heat, of vegetable and of purely animal life ; they affected the elements, and the elements affected the temperaments, the passions, and therefore, at least indirectly, the powers of the human will. It was impossible with their ideas, to look up at night to the expanding heavens with its brilliant stars, and Milky Way, and planets of uncertain course, and not feel their influence over the poor inferior world within their bosom. Were not these crystalline heavens always radiant with light ? Were they not always pure and calm, swiftly and silently pursuing their eternal round ? Where was there any trace of stain, or change or death ? Were they not the footstool of God himself, and the radiant mansions of the just made perfect ?

It was Scotus who first ventured to throw a doubt on the physical reality of this enchanting picture. The question was asked by St. Thomas, as it is asked by Suarez, are the heavens, like the sublunary world, made up of matter and form ; and is the matter of the same nature as the *materia prima* of this lower world of ours ? The whole Thomistic School—in fact, all the Scholastics before Scotus—answered in the negative. But he said yes ; and thereby laid the axe to the root of the tree. He does not, and he dare not in those days, deny the doctrine of incorruptible heavens ; but by asserting the identity of its primal matter with that of the corruptible world, he virtually denied it, and sapped the foundations of the unsubstantial fabric, leaving an easier task for Cusa, Kepler, and the rest, for whom it was reserved to prove with certainty the bold thesis which he first advanced. In this, as in other respects, Scotus directed the current of philosophic thought from its Aristotelian channel, and greatly

influenced its future direction. For instance, Dante was the bard of Scholasticism, the poetic expression of its philosophy and theology in as full and perfect a sense as St. Thomas and Scotus are its logical expression. It is impossible for any one who has even a slight acquaintance with the immortal Florentine not to feel this truth, which is indeed admitted by all his profounder critics. He expresses, it is true, more than once his contempt for mere logic, and even makes the demon a logician ; ¹ but it is from the ethics ² and physics of the Scholastics that his poetry gets life and inspiration. Yet, as M. Ozanam has pointed out in his able and eloquent critique on Dante, he always inclines to the Franciscan School, the School of Bonaventure and Scotus, rather than to the Thomist side. As Ptolemy and the Scholastics made nine heavens, so does Dante put nine circles in his *Inferno*, and makes nine sciences complete the cycle of human knowledge. He gives expression to a hesitating faith in astrology ; and clothes more than once in poetic language the metaphysics of the primal matter and substantial forms. But it is, above all, in his conception and description of the heavens, that he gets his inspiration from the Scholastic theories.

As Tennyson has shown us what conceptions of beauty float around the revolving orbs of Copernicus, so Dante, in language of loftiest imagery, describes the Milky Way glowing with starry gems ; and far beyond all material orbs, he places the highest empyreal heaven itself, describing it as radiant in light inaccessible, and like the gods of Epicurus, resting in serene repose :—

“ Where never creeps a cloud, nor moves a wind,
Nor ever falls the least white star of snow,
Nor ever lowest roll of thunder moans,
Nor sound of human sorrow mounts to mar
Their sacred everlasting calm ! ”

In conclusion, although we certainly are not expected to accept the doctrines of the Scholastics in physical science,

¹ “ Tu non pensavi ch'io loico fossi.”—*Infer.* xxvii. 41.

² “ Cessando la morale filosofia, le altre scienze sarebbero celate alcun tempo ; e non sarebbe generalizione ne vita de felicità.”—*Convito*, ii. cap. 15.

we venture to remind our readers of the language applied to Scholastic Theology by the late Pontiff Leo XIII. :—

“ *Divino illius munere qui solus dat spiritum scientiae et sapientiae et intellectus, quique ecclesiam suam per saeculorum aetates, prout opus est, novis beneficiis auget, inventa est a majoribus nostris, sapientissimis viris, Theologia Scholastica, quam duo potissimum gloriosi doctores, angelicus S. Thomas et seraphicus S. Bonaventura . . . ornavunt, eamque optime dispositam multisque modis praeclare explicatam posteris tradiderunt.*”¹

These words were first used by Sixtus V., and are repeated by Pope Leo, who then goes on to extol the wonderful benefits conferred on the Church by the teaching of St. Thomas, both in philosophy and theology. St. Thomas has, indeed, no equal in divine wisdom among the Scholastics, but certainly Scotus comes next to the Angelic Doctor. It must be borne in mind also that the teaching of St. Thomas is, in many respects, both in philosophy and theology, widely different from the doctrines of the Thomist School; and the Scotists, not altogether without reason, declare that in many points, in which the disciples differ widely, the masters themselves are quite in accord. The Thomist doctrine on grace is a case in point. For great theologians who belong to neither school maintain with good reason that St. Thomas never taught the doctrine of the *promotio physica*, which is so strenuously maintained by most of his disciples. At all events Ireland has good reason to be proud of her son; and we hope that the day will never come when the name of Duns Scotus will be forgotten in the halls of the *Alma Mater* of the Irish priesthood.

¹ See the Encyclical *Aeterni Patris*.

THE BOOK OF DEER.

ADAMNAN'S *Life of Columba* and the *Book of Deer* are the only surviving literary monuments known to us of the ancient Celtic or Columban Church of Scotland. The former was accidentally discovered in the year 1845 at the bottom of an old book-chest in the public library of Schaffhausen, in Switzerland. The latter, in like manner, though preserved in the University of Cambridge, was first made known to scholars in 1850 by the keen eye of Mr. Bradshaw, an eminent antiquarian scholar. It was then discovered that so early as 1715 the manuscript had been acquired by the University amongst the books of Dr. John Moore, Bishop of Norwich, which were purchased by George I. for a sum of six thousand guineas, and was by him presented to the University. How the manuscript came into the possession of Moore is, I believe, quite unknown; but to him the literary world owes the preservation of this most interesting and unique monument of the early Celtic Church of Scotland.

The manuscript itself is a small and nearly square octavo, numbering eighty-six folios of parchment, written on both sides of the leaf, in a dark brown ink, but in a hand that is still wonderfully clear and legible. The pages were ruled with a sharp-pointed instrument, and, as in the case of some other ancient manuscripts of the Irish school, the letters are not written on the line, but beneath it, hanging from it as it were. This arrangement was found to suit the Celtic letters better than our modern style, as some of them have rather long tails which hang from the line more gracefully than they could rest upon it.

The manuscript contains portions of the first three Gospels, and the entire Gospel of St. John, together with what the editor regards as "a fragment of the Office for the Visitation of the Sick," and also the Apostles' Creed. All this is in Latin, written in one uniform hand, and in the now well-known Roman miniscule lettering peculiar to the Irish

school of scribes. The initial letters, as was usual in our Irish manuscripts, are greatly enlarged and ornamented with patches of different colours, and terminate in the dogs' heads or similar dragonesque forms, so characteristic of our Celtic ornamentation. The pages have also ornamental borders, with panels of interlaced work of the character usually seen in Celtic art. There are also full-page portraits of the four Evangelists, but the style of art is much inferior to that exhibited in the *Book of Kells*, and several other of the Celtic illuminated manuscripts, that are known to have been executed in Ireland.

A much more important question is the age and authorship of the book. Of the latter we know nothing except what can be gathered from a colophon written in Gaelic by the scribe, who wrote the Gospels. It has been translated to this effect:—" (Be it) on the conscience of every one, in whom shall be for grace the booklet with splendour, that he give a blessing on the soul of the wretchock who wrote it." ¹ Who this " poor wretch " who wrote it was, no one can say. In his humility he conceals his name; but it is most likely he was a member of the community of Deer, who transcribed from an older and now lost manuscript, in all probability written by Columcille himself, the founder of the Celtic Monastery of Deer.

The age and character of the penmanship would bear out this view. Westwood holds that the manuscript is certainly not later than the ninth century; and Dr. Whitley Stokes declares that the Gaelic of the colophon (printed in the note) is identical with that of the earliest Irish glosses given by Zeuss in the *Grammatica Celtica*, which belongs to the seventh and eighth centuries. Columcille died at a much earlier date, in 597; and, moreover, the penmanship is quite different from that of the *Book of Durrow* and of the *Book of Kells*, which have with more or less plausibility been attributed to Columba himself. Besides, the mistakes made in transcription by the scribe show that he was only indifferently acquainted with the Latin language, and that

¹ Here is the original:—" Forchubus caichduini imbia arrath inlebran colli aratardda bendacht foranmain intruagain rodscribai. . . ."

he was much more at home in the transcription of his native Gaelic. It seems probable, therefore, that this manuscript was written sometime during the eight or ninth century, when the original from which it was copied had begun to suffer from the wear and tear of two hundred or two hundred and fifty years.

But venerable and interesting as this transcription of the Gospels undoubtedly is, there are other entries in the Gaelic tongue of far greater interest from a historical and antiquarian point of view. The most important of all is that which gives an account of the foundation of the monastery of Deer itself. And although these Gaelic entries are of later date than the transcript of the Gospels, having been inserted at different times from the ninth to the twelfth century, still they are of the highest interest, because they put on record the traditions of the monastery itself as to its origin and foundation, whilst it was yet, comparatively speaking, a young and flourishing institution. Here is the tradition of its origin :—

" Columcille and Drostan, son of Cosgrach, his pupil, came from Hi, as God had shewn to them, unto Abbordoboir, and Bede the Pict was mormaer of Buchan before them ; and it was he that gave them that town in freedom for ever from mormaer and toisech. They came after that to the other town (of Deer), and it was pleasing to Columcille, because it was full of God's grace ; and he asked it of the mormaer, to wit, Bede, that he should give it to him ; and he did not give it ; and a son of his took an illness after refusing the clerics, and he was nigh unto death. After this the mormaer went to entreat the clerics, that they should make prayer for his son, that health should come to him ; and he gave in offering to them from Cloch in Tiprat to Cloch Pette Meic Garnait. They made the prayer, and health came to him. After that Columcille gave to Drostan that town, and blessed it, and left as his word—' Whosoever shall come against it, let him not be many-yeared or victorious.' Drostan's tears came on parting from Columcille. Then said Columcille, ' Let Dear (a tear) be its name henceforward. '"

And so it came to pass. What a simple and touching narrative in the old ancestral tongue of Erin, and what a flood of light it throws on the history of that time ! We know from Bede and Adamnan that Brude Mac Maelcon was king of the Northern Picts when Columba first preached the Gospel to his subjects. Tighernach records his death in 583, so that he was most likely the king who ruled the Picts when Columba made his way—by land or

sea we know not—to Aberdour, on the southern shore of the Moray Firth. The great territory now comprising Aberdeen and Banffshire, between the Spey and the Dee, was then one of the seven provinces into which the kingdom of the Picts was divided, and which, even at that early period, was known as Buchan, including also what was afterwards known as the great earldom of Mar. But here we find it ruled over during the lifetime of Columba by Bede the Pict, who is described as *mormaer*, or high steward, of Buchan, ruling in the king's name, and collecting the royal dues from his subjects. This Gaelic term is equivalent to Irish *ard-maer*, which is used by our own annalists to describe "the steward of Patrick's family in Armagh,"¹ and also the great steward of the southern O'Neills. The same official is sometimes called *exactor*,² and sometimes *satrapas*³ in the Latin chronicles, the former referring to his duty as chief tax collector, and the latter denoting his office as governor under the king. The *toisech*, or captain, was chief of the clan—an office both in Erin and Alba, partly hereditary and partly elective, which has survived in the Highlands almost down to our own day. "Freedom from *mormaer* and *toisech*," therefore, means that the monastic lands of Deer were to be exempt from all royal dues, as well as from all tribal rents and claims of every kind. The fear of Columcille's curse may have secured this immunity for Deer and Aberdour under the Pictish kings; but if so it was an exception, for we find it expressly stated in the chronicle of the Picts and Scots that it was King Giric, who reigned from 878 to 889, "that first gave liberty to the Scottish Church, which had been until now under servitude, according to the law and custom of the Picts."⁴ The family of Deer probably accepted

¹ *Annals of Ulster*, A.D. 922.

² *Annals of Ulster*, A.D. 729.

³ *Pictish Chronicle*, A.D. 965.

⁴ The servitude here referred to was the liability of the Church lands to various services and exactions claimed by the king and the chiefs for their personal maintenance, as well as for the defence of the kingdom. It was rendered still more galling after the expulsion of the Columban monks by King Naiton, in 717, for not accepting the Roman Easter. The words of the chronicle are:—"Hic primus dedit libertatem ecclesiae Scoticanæ, quæ sub servitute erat usque ad illud tempus ex consuetudine et more Pictorum." (Page 151.)

the Roman Easter, and thus escaped expulsion by King Naiton beyond Drum Alban about 717, when most of the Columban communities were driven out of the territory of the Pictish king. About the year 850, however, the Pictish dynasty was overthrown, and Kenneth Mac Alpin, "primus rex Scottorum," "acquired the kingdom of Scone for the Gael." This was about the time the *Book of Deer* was transcribed, after which the monastery greatly prospered. So we have entries of some eighteen or twenty different grants of land made to the community at different periods down to the twelfth century. In those grants we find reference to "the mormaer's share" and to "the toisech's share," as well as to private rights in the land; and in some instances we find the shares of all three are made over at once; whilst in other cases now the mormaer, now the toisech, and again the private owner, assign their respective rights or shares to the monastery.

The last document in the Book is a Latin charter of the great and good King David I., which shows the importance of recording the grants made to the monastery in this monastic registry. Attempts were made at various times during the eleventh century to secularize the monastic possessions, or impose new burdens on the lands of the religious communities under various pretexts. Too often these attempts were successful and in many cases the estates of the religious houses passed into the hands of laymen, who claimed them as their hereditary patrimony. It is evident that similar attempts were made at Deer, but the monks appealed to the justice of the king, and produced this book as evidence of their title and immunities. Thereupon the king issued his charter declaring the clerics of Deer free from every service and exaction of laymen, "as is written in their book, and as they pleaded at Banff, and swore at Aberdeen."

Drostan's name is Pictish, but his father's name, Cosgrach, is Irish, and he is described as "dalta," that is, pupil or literary foster-son of Columcille in Hy, from which they are represented as coming first to Aberdour, and afterwards to Deer. Aberdour, the river mouth of the Doboire, is a small sheltered bay, looking north from the rocky shores of Buchan, at the north-eastern extremity of Aberdeen. There appears to have

been a considerable population at that time in the neighbourhood of the cathair or "town" of Aberdour; and it may be that Bede the Pict lived in the fortress of Dundarg, that is, the Red Dun, which was situated at the extremity of a small ro or promontory that was completely isolated by the cliffs on the sea side, and on the land side by deep earthworks cut across the narrow neck connecting the promontory with the mainland. No trace of the monastery founded here by Columcille and Drostan now exists, but we know that "the parish church was dedicated to St. Drostan, and was situated by the brink of a gorge, on a ledge or tableland overlooking the burn of the Dour, about one hundred and fifty yards distant from the shore of Moray Firth. In the beginning of the sixteenth century the bones of the Saint were here preserved in a stone chest, and many cures were effected by means of them."¹ The lesson in the Breviary of Aberdeen² gives us further, and, no doubt, authentic information:—

"The blessed Drostan, son of Cosgrach, of the royal stock of the Scoti (the Irish), having heard even in his boyish years the mysteries of the Incarnation and Passion of our Lord, when he had come to mature age, asked to devote himself to the service of Almighty God. His parents, therefore, gave him over to his *uncle*, St. Columba, then resident in Ireland, to be educated, and he afterwards assumed the monastic habit at Dalquongale. On the death of the abbot he was elected in his place, but after ruling his monks well . . . he betook himself to the eremitical life, and built the Church of Glenesk. Here he gave sight to a blind priest, Symon, and resisted, by compunction and maceration of the flesh, the assaults of the demon. His relics are preserved in a stone tomb in Aberdowyr, where many sick persons find relief."

At Glenesk, in Angus, his memory still survives; for close to the site of the church, which he founded on the romantic shore of lonely Lochlee, we find "Droustie's Well" and "Droustie's Meadow," but no trace whatsoever of his oratory or his cell. He was patron of several churches in Scotland, and his day is December 16th.³

Deer, Columba's second foundation in Buchan, is twelve

¹ Dr. Stuart's preface to the *Book of Deer*, page 5.

² *Calendars of Scottish Saints*, page 327.

³ Fordun states, but without authority, that St. Drostan's mother was Fyn Wennem, daughter of Dromingart, one of the sons of Aidan, King of Dalradia, referred to by Adamnan. She was married to Conanrodus, son to the King of Demetia, the father of Drostan.

miles inland, and south of Aberdour. The old Celtic monastery was built, like so many other of our earliest Irish foundations, on a site strikingly commanding and picturesque. As in the case of Aberdour, the parish church appears to stand on the site of the old Celtic monastery, which is a knoll or rising ground, now called Tap Tillery, on the bank of the river Ugie, which at this point nearly encircled the monastic grounds, thus rendering the monastery easily defensible. Old Melrose on the Tweed, and St. Boniface's monastery at Invergowrie on the Tay, were situated in exactly a similar position—the river in both cases nearly insulating the monastic enclosures. It was, no doubt, St. Columba's perception of the suitability of this position that induced him to ask it of Bede, the mormaer of Buchan, and there is some reason to think that the high steward had himself a residence close at hand, as the remains of several large raths are still noticeable in the neighbourhood. "Whoever shall come against it," said Columba, "let him not be many-yearred or victorious." This *oratio infelix*, recorded in their book, and, no doubt, well promulgated by the monks of Deer, helped to preserve the monastery inviolate for many centuries. In King David's time a certain Colban was mormaer of Buchan, and doubtless, like his royal master, was a protector of the monastery of Deer. His grandson, Fergus, became first Earl of Buchan, and by marriage with his daughter, Marjory, the earldom passed from the Gael to the Norman in the person of William Comyn, who thus became Earl of Buchan in right of his wife. But the Norman thanes had small love for the old Celtic monasteries; so we find that this Earl of Buchan founded a great Cistercian abbey at New Deer, about two miles to the westward of St. Drostan's foundation; and he appears to have endowed it with a portion of St. Drostan's lands, the remainder having been assigned for the maintenance of a parochial church. This was in 1219. But Columba's prayer was soon heard, and the fall of the great house of Comyn with its three earldoms of Buchan, Mar, and Menteith, was as sudden and complete as its rise. The Comyns fought for England against the Bruce, and were thus neither "many-yearred nor victorious." Part of their forfeited estates adjoining the

abbey lands of Deer was granted to Sir Robert de Keith, Earl Marischal, one of Bruce's staunchest adherents. In 1551 the son of the then Earl Marischal succeeded his uncle Robert Keith as titular abbot of Deer, holding the abbey lands *in commendam*, and therefore called the "Abbot and Commendator of Deer." In 1587 he resigned all the lands, titles, and other property of the abbey into the king's hands, to be erected, as was then the fashion, into a temporal lordship for himself, his heirs male, and assigns—his immediate heir being his brother George, Earl Marischal, who was already, on one pretext or another, in possession of most of the lands. Now the wife of this Earl George had a "tender conscience," and forbade her husband "to leave such a consuming moth in his house as was the sacraledgeous meddling with the abisie of Deir."¹ But the earl was inexorable, and would not resign the lands. Thereupon next night she saw in a dream a number of religious men in their habits leaving the old monastery, and proceeding to the crag of Dunnoture, on which the earl's castle was built, where they set about undermining the vast rock with their pen-knives. Smiling at their vain efforts, she went to call her husband to witness their foolish attempt, but lo! as she returned she saw the crag was undermined, so that rock and castle toppled over into the sea. Once more the curse of Columba was fulfilled, for in the next century the powerful house of the great Earl Marischal was completely overthrown, and thenceforward disappears from the history of Scotland.

The *Book of Deer* was ably edited in the year 1869 for the Spalding Club, by its learned and accomplished secretary, Dr. John Stuart. The editor regards the Latin prayers that are found after the Gospels as a portion of the Office for the Visitation of the Sick. But in this he is clearly mistaken, as it is quite obvious to any person familiar with the liturgy of the Catholic Church that the fragments in question are a portion of the Mass. The first of them is described in the manuscript itself as the "*Oratio ante Dominicam orationem*;"²

¹ The word is spelt Der, Dsir, Dear, and Deer. Dear (a tear) was the ancient form, and confirms the traditional account of its origin.

² This is the usual heading for the Lord's Prayer in ancient missals: "*Oratio ad (or ante) Dominicam orationem.*" See *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, "Missa," page 1199.

the second is obviously what is now called the "Communion," preceded also by a rubric in Irish¹ directing when to give the Sacrifice to the communicant at Mass. Both these portions of the liturgy were in ancient times variable in different churches according to local or national usage, and that is, doubtless, the reason why we find special reference to them here. The Apostles' Creed seems to have been inserted by the scribe after the Gospels merely as a private profession of faith on his own part.

¹ "Hisund dubei sacorfaice dau."

THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND THE EARLY IRISH CHURCH.

On the 29th of August, 1070, Lanfranc, the first theologian of his age, was consecrated with great solemnity Archbishop of Canterbury. Towards the close of the same year, the monk Thomas of Caen, Archbishop-elect of York, came to Canterbury to be consecrated. Lanfranc required him to take an oath of obedience to himself and his successors, as primate of all England. This, Thomas of York refused to do, on the plea that his see was independent of Canterbury, and thereupon Lanfranc refused him consecration. Thomas appealed to the king, William the Conqueror, who, although at first displeased with Lanfranc, afterwards induced Thomas to promise absolute obedience to Lanfranc, and conditional obedience to his successors, if, on inquiry, Lanfranc's claim to the primacy should prove to be well-founded. Thomas promised, and was then consecrated by Lanfranc.

Next year both prelates went to Rome, and Lanfranc especially was received with great honour by the Pope, Alexander III., who had been one of his pupils at Bec, in Normandy. At the audience, however, Thomas made complaint to the Pope of Lanfranc's attempt to usurp a primatial jurisdiction over York and its suffragan sees. Lanfranc defended himself as best he could; but the Pope declared that the question should be settled at a full council of the English prelates, and that a Papal Legate would attend. This council was summoned for the next year, and was held at Winchester in presence of the king and the legate, as well as of the nobles and the prelates of the kingdom. Both Thomas and Lanfranc were able canonists, and each had a large party of zealous supporters; the question at issue was fully discussed, and was decided in favour of Lanfranc.

It was at this council, held in 1072, that the Archbishop of Canterbury for the first time *claimed* a primacy over the

churches of Ireland. William of Malmesbury gives a very full account of the transactions of the council, and the final decrees as contained in Lanfranc's own letter to the Pope. "The ecclesiastical history," says Lanfranc, "of the English nation was produced, which was written by Bede, a priest of the Church of York itself, and a doctor of the English people. In this work Bede expressly declares that Lanfranc's predecessors exercised primatial rights, and the pastoral charge over the Church of York, as well as over all Britain, *and also over Ireland.*"¹

It is particularly noteworthy, that although Lanfranc represents Bede as stating that this primatial right over Ireland was exercised by his predecessors, yet the council itself, in its solemn decree, makes no mention of Lanfranc's primacy over Ireland. The assembled prelates, with the Papal Legate, Hubert, at their head, admit his primacy over the provinces of Canterbury and York, *etiam ad extremos Scottiæ fines*, but there is not a single word about Ireland, and the context plainly shows that "Scotia" here means Scotland, and Ireland, in Lanfranc's own letter, is called Hibernia.²

Now, as to Bede himself, there are only two passages which have any reference to this claim to a primacy over Ireland. In one passage—Book 2, c. 4 of Bede's History—Archbishop Laurence, the immediate successor of St. Augustine, is said to have extended his pastoral solicitude even to the Scots who dwelt in Ireland;³ but the only reason assigned by Bede is that Laurence and his chorepiscopi, Mellitus and Justus, addressed a letter to the Irish bishops and abbots, in which they beg the prelates to reform certain abuses, of which the principal, and the only one mentioned,

¹ "Antecessores meos super Eboracensem ecclesiam totamque insulam, quam Britanniam vocant, necnon et Hiberniam, primatum gessisse curamque pastorem omnibus impendisse."—*De Gestis Pontificum*.

² "Et tandem aliquando diversis diversarum auctoritatibus probatum atque ostensum est quod Eboracensis Ecclesia Cantuariensi debeat subiacere, ejusque archiepiscopi, ut primatis totius *Britanniæ*, dispositionibus, in his quæ ad religionem pertinent, in omnibus obedire."—*De Gestis Pontificum*.

³ "Denique," says Bede, "non solum novæ quæ de Angliis erant collecta, ecclesiæ curam gerebat, sed et veterum *Britanniæ* incolarum necnon et Scottarum qui Hiberniam insulam *Britanniæ* proximam incolunt, populis pastorem impendisse sollicitudinem curabat."

was the celebration of Easter at a different time from their own. We have only the beginning of the letter ¹ given in Bede; but it certainly furnishes no argument for claiming a primacy over Ireland, for it is not at all an authoritative appeal, but a request to conform their discipline on this point to the continental practice, for the sake of peace and unity.

The second passage from Bede to which Lanfranc might possibly refer is contained in the First Book, c. 27, *Interrogatio* 7. In answer to Augustine's question—"Qualiter debemus cum Galliarum Britanniarumque episcopis agere"—the Pope, St. Gregory, replies:—"In Galliarum episcopis nullam tibi auctoritatem tribuimus . . . *Britanniarum* vero omnes episcopos tue fraternitati committimus, ut indocti doceantur, infirmi persuasione roborentur, perversi auctoritate corrigantur." There can be no doubt that there is here question of some kind of jurisdiction, and it is granted to Augustine and to his successors over the British Isles, and therefore over Ireland. So say Hanmer and Campion, and many others of the same school. Dr. Lanigan refutes this notion with his usual learning and skill. British Isles, indeed! If *Gallia* because it contained several divisions, was the common word for Gaul, why not *Britannia* for the same reason simply mean Britain? As a fact we know the Romans divided the country into *Britannia Prima*, *Secunda*, and so on; and Roman writers frequently used the word in this sense to include all the parts. It means therefore not the *British Isles*; but the *Britains*, that is all the divisions of Britain.²

Neither Lanfranc, therefore, nor those who came after him, do justice to Bede when they represent the Saint as an authority for this exercise of primatial jurisdiction by the Archbishop of Canterbury over the ancient Church of Ireland.

Dr. Milner, indeed, following Cressy, takes a somewhat different view of the matter. It was not, he says, a primatial,

¹ He addresses them—"Dominis carissimis fratribus episcopis vel abbatibus per universam Scottiam Laurentius, Mellitus, et Justus, servi servorum Dei."

² Book v. c. 24. Bede himself applies the term *Britannias* to Great Britain—"Claudius Britannias adiens plurimam *insulæ* partem in deditionem recepit."

but a legatine jurisdiction, that was exercised by the Archbishops of Canterbury over this country. The words of the Pope to Augustine prove this much at any rate. By no means : they only prove in that case a legatine jurisdiction over *Britain* ; and if it were merely legatine, then, as Thomas of York observed in the council of Winchester, the jurisdiction being given to the man, and not to the see, would not descend to the successors of St. Augustine in the see of Canterbury. We think this a good argument if the grant is not expressly made to the see ; but Lanfranc did not think so, for he argued that as the primacy of Peter, though expressly given only to Peter himself, yet passed to his successors, so the jurisdiction given to St. Augustine—*super omnes Britanniæ episcopos*—passed to his successors although no mention is made of them in express terms. It is certain, however, that the words in Bede contain no grant either of primatial or legatine jurisdiction over the Irish prelates, and if the Council of Winchester thought they did, they certainly in defining Lanfranc's jurisdiction would not have omitted all reference to Ireland. There seems little doubt, however, both from the tone of Lanfranc's letter to the Pope, as well as from expressions which he and Anselm used in their letters to certain of the Irish prelates, that they would not be unwilling to assert their claim to a primacy over Ireland, if they thought it likely to be acquiesced in by the Pope and by the Irish prelates. And those who maintain the ancient Primacy of Canterbury over our National Church, do not fail to use this argument. The prelates of Canterbury, they say, especially Lanfranc and Anselm, *exercised* primatial jurisdiction over the Irish prelates of the eleventh and the early part of the twelfth century ; and the Irish Bishops submitted without protest or complaint ; even sometimes of their own motion they invoked this exercise of authority.

This is an interesting question, to determine exactly the nature of the relations that existed between the Archbishops of Canterbury and some of the Irish prelates during the period that intervened between the Norman Conquest of England and of Ireland. Almost the only authentic evidence on the subject is to be found in the letters of these prelates

themselves, especially of Lanfranc and Anselm.¹ Their letters are to be found in Usher's Sylloge, and in D'Achery's edition of the works of these Fathers, first published at Paris in 1648. Our references are to this edition as published by Migne.

It is well known that the Ostmen—Danes and Norwegians—first attacked the coasts of Ireland in the closing years of the eighth century. In 836 a large Danish fleet sailed up the estuary of the Liffey, where they established themselves under Turgesius, in a fortified camp near the spot where Dublin Castle now stands. He was slain or drowned about 845, for the dates differ, and the Ostmen of Dublin were severely handled by King Malachy; but a few years later in 853, three Norwegian princes, Aulif, Sitric, and Ivar, who were brothers, landed in Ireland, and became respectively kings of Dublin, Waterford, and Limerick. From that period until the advent of the Anglo-Normans, these three cities remained in the hands of the Danes. They were the strongholds of the invaders, whence they sallied out to burn, plunder, slay and be slain. During the 370 years of the Danish occupation of the Irish lakes and seaports, it is said that more than 500,000 men perished in mutual slaughter. Yet the "Foreigners" kept their ground; and although their power was on the wane, especially after the victory of Clontarf, still they were allowed to hold the seaports named above as their own cities, subject at times to the authority of the Irish Princes, but frequently throwing off the yoke.

In the year 948 the Ostmen of Dublin, or at least the greater portion, became Christians in the reign of Godfrey III., who founded St. Mary's Abbey for Benedictine Monks, on the northern bank of the Liffey. But Christians or not, they never spared church, priest, or monk of the Irish race, as the *Annals of the Four Masters* clearly proves. And yet they were pious after a fashion of their own. Aulif V., brother of that same Godfrey III., died a great penitent at Columba's shrine in Iona in 981; his son Sitric III. died as a pilgrim on his way to Rome in 1028; this Sitric's son again was slain

¹ And also in a few paragraphs of the Monk Eadmer's *Vita S. Anselmi*.

by the Saxons when going on the same pilgrimage to Rome in 1034; and it was Sitric IV., son of the last mentioned, and grandson of Sitric III., who in 1038 founded the Cathedral of Christ Church. The Black Book of Christ's Church, an ancient and authentic record, tells us that Sitric, in conjunction with Donatus, or Dunan, Bishop of Dublin, founded the Cathedral in 1038, on the spot where a stone-roofed oratory had been previously built.¹ Unfortunately we know nothing else of this Donatus, whether he was of Irish or Danish extraction, where, or when, or by whom he was consecrated or whether he was the first Bishop or not of Danish Dublin. His death is said to have taken place in 1074, and this date brings us to Lanfranc and his connection with the Irish Church.

We find an exceedingly interesting letter of Lanfranc, it is No. 33 in D'Achery, addressed—Venerando Hiberniae episcopo Domnaldo, et iis qui sibi litteras transmiserunt salutem et benedictionem. Who was this Domnaldus, Bishop of Ireland? D'Alton says absurdly enough that he was Donatus, the Dane, and that he is expressly called Bishop of Dublin in the letter. There is not a word in the letter either about Dublin, or Donatus, which shows that D'Alton had never read it. D'Achery is inclined to think he was Bishop of Armagh or Dublin; but Domnald of Armagh did not become Bishop until 1092, when Lanfranc was dead; so we think Lanigan is right in regarding the letter as addressed to Domhnall or Domnaldus, Archbishop of Cashel, who as the Four Masters tell us, died in 1099 full of years, and honours, and good works.

We cannot find the date of his consecration, but as he was seventy when he died, in all probability he had been bishop for many years. He was of the Dalcassian race, probably of the Royal family of the O'Briens, and, as we shall see, the O'Briens at this time seem to have had intimate relations with the Normans of England and the Danes of Ireland. There is certainly no other Domnaldus to whom, with any show of probability, this letter could have been

¹ Such is the explanation usually given of the "Stone Vaults"—the phrase used in the *Liber Niger*.

addressed. It seems Domnaldus and some others had addressed a letter to Lanfranc, in which they put several questions to him, the most eminent churchman of the age, regarding (*a*) the necessity of the Eucharist for infants (*b*) the baptism of children by laymen in case of necessity; as well as several questions on secular matters.

Lanfranc, in this letter, apologises for being so brief in his reply, as he was away from home, and the messenger would not consent to remain even a few days for a fuller answer. He declares, however, that the Eucharist is not necessary for the salvation of baptised infants, and that on this point they were misinformed concerning the discipline of the English and Continental churches. Neither is the text in *John* vi. 54 to be understood in the sense of what is necessary *necessitate medii*; it only means that those who have arrived at the years of discretion—*quisque divini mysterii per intelligentiam capax*—should, as we would say, receive it *aut in re aut in voto*. Baptism, too, may be lawfully conferred by a layman in case of necessity; and even some of the holy martyrs, he adds, were saved by their sufferings and death for Christ's sake even before they had received baptism.

As regards the secular questions put to him he declines to answer them; heretofore he spent much time in these studies, but since he became a bishop he has renounced them. This letter was written about 1081,¹ and goes to show that some of our Irish prelates at the time were inclined to follow the ancient practice of administering the Eucharist to children, and interpreted too strictly the words of our Lord both regarding baptism and the Eucharist. The letter of Lanfranc was then of great theological value, but surely contains nothing which can be construed into an assumption of primacy over the bishops of Ireland.

The next letter in the Benedictine edition, but the first in order of time, was sent to Lanfranc by the clergy and people of Dublin—*Venerando Sanctae Cantuariensis eccle-*

¹ According to Usher, who says it was written in the eleventh year of Lanfranc's episcopacy, and quotes the Annals of Canterbury to that effect. He thought, however, that it was addressed Domnald of Armagh.

siae metropolitano Lanfranco, clerus et populus ecclesiae Dublinensis, debitam subjectionem.

In this letter they state, that as Lanfranc himself knew, Dublin, *which is the metropolitan church of Ireland*, has been widowed by the death of its pastor ; that they have elected for their bishop a man called Patrick, well known to them, and in every way qualified for the pastoral charge, and they request Lanfranc to consecrate him to be their bishop.

This letter must have been written shortly after the death of Donatus, and contains the first indication of the supremacy of Canterbury having been recognised by any Irish Church. But the clergy and people of Dublin were Ostmen ; the Normans, who had conquered England, were of the same race. Lanfranc, too, was the first ecclesiastic of his time in point of fame and learning, if we except the Pope just then elected, Gregory VII. ; and so Dublin being a new church of converted Northmen, confined to the walls of their own city, and holding frequent intercourse with England by sea, naturally turned for protection and guidance to the head of the Norman Church in England, rather than to the prelates of Ireland, whose most sacred shrines they had so often profaned. There can be no question, therefore, that the Ostmen of Dublin, Waterford, and Limerick, recognised the primacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury over these three Sees from the Conquest of England in 1066, to the Invasion of Ireland in 1170, or at least until the Irish prelates of Armagh, Cashel, Dublin, and Tuam received their pallia in 1152. In one point, however, the letter is inaccurate. Dublin was not in 1074 the Metropolitan Church of Ireland, nor, indeed, a Metropolitan Church at all until 1152, when Gregory became an Archbishop with jurisdiction over its present suffragan sees. Lanigan thinks the words were interpolated, especially as the statement is not repeated in subsequent letters. In any case it is without foundation ; Dublin was the Metropolis of Danish Ireland, but not at all the Metropolitan Church of Ireland. The words are : " Ecclesia Dublinensis, quae Hiberniae insulae Metropolis est."

Lanfranc at once complied with the request of the good citizens of Dublin. He examined Patrick, and finding him

sufficiently expert in human and divine knowledge, gave him episcopal consecration in St. Paul's Church, about the end of the year 1074. On that occasion Patrick made the following profession of obedience. After a preamble on the excellence of obedience, he adds, "I, Patrick, the prelate elected to govern Dublin, the Metropolis of Ireland, do, Reverend Father Lanfranc, Primate of the *Britains*, and Archbishop of the holy Church of Canterbury, offer to thee this charter of my profession, and I promise to obey thee and thy successors in all things appertaining to the Christian religion." Lanfranc was fresh from his contention with Thomas of York for the primacy, and evidently had these words, "Primate of the *Britains*," especially inserted from Bede. He may have been Primate of the *Britains*, but he was never Primate of *Ireland*, except in so far as the Danish churches already mentioned voluntarily submitted to his authority. As Dr. Lanigan remarks, the formal preamble shows such a profession was a novelty in Irish History. Whether this Patrick was a Dane or native Irishman cannot be ascertained. The name is Irish; but it might be assumed by a Dane entering into religion, or even at his baptism, as happened on other occasions.

Lanfranc sent Patrick back to Dublin, after his consecration, with letters testimonial, highly complimentary to the bearer. The letter was addressed to Gothric, "the glorious King of Ireland," a large hyperbole, for this Gothric, successor to Godred Crovan, King of Dublin and Mann, was the vassal of Turlough O'Brien, who allowed him to rule the citizens of Dublin as their immediate prince or earl. The letter is remarkable for some charges which the writer brings against the Irish people—at least against the Danes of Dublin. But inasmuch as Lanfranc makes the same complaints in a letter to Turlough O'Brien, sent, apparently by the same bearer, we must take him to mean that they were general. His informant must have been the Bishop Patrick himself; and hence we fear there was some ground for complaining of the prevalence of these abuses at that time in the Irish Church:—(1) In Gothric's Kingdom of Dublin—in regno vestro—some persons took wives from their own kindred, or

from the kindred of their deceased wives ; (2) others desert their lawful wives when they think fit ; and (3) some go so far as to exchange their wives in an infamous commerce—*nonnulli suas aliis dare et aliarum infanda commutatione recipere*. Lanfranc justly deplores these enormities, and beseeches the king to aid the Bishop Patrick in eradicating them from his dominions.¹

Lanfranc sent by Patrick another letter to Turlough O'Brien, a grandson of Brian Boru, who at this time was the most powerful prince in the kingdom, and supreme monarch over all the Danish cities. Hence the Archbishop of Canterbury calls him "the magnificent King of Ireland," that is, the supreme ruler of the country. After extolling the princely virtues of the monarch he complains of the same abuses of which he had spoken in his letter to Gothric, with the further addition that (*a*) bishops were consecrated only by one bishop, (*b*) that more than one were ordained in many villages and towns, and (*c*) that infants were baptised without the chrism.

These last charges may be dismissed as of minor importance, and were probably quite true ; for in many things the ancient discipline still continued in the Church of Ireland, and *chorepiscopi* were frequently consecrated by only one bishop, and of that class there were still many prelates in Ireland who had frequently very small sees, and were sometimes without any fixed see. Neither was it customary to use the chrism, where the bishop administered baptism, because the baptised were confirmed immediately after. It was only when priests began to baptise solemnly that the chrism came to be generally used.

The charges regarding the violation of the marriage laws are more serious, and we fear, to some extent, well founded. Dr. Lanigan thinks these crimes were confined chiefly to the Danes, and certainly in his letter to Turlough, Lanfranc does not make the charge of openly interchanging wives. But Anselm, as we shall see, does make the same charge, when addressing some of the Irish Bishops. In truth, discipline

¹ Pope Gregory VII. also addressed a letter to the king concerning similar abuses in Ireland, but he is not specific in his charges.

and morality at the time were greatly relaxed in Ireland, and the wonder is, not that things were so bad, but that they were not still worse. For 300 years a pagan foe lived in incessant warfare with the people; there was no supreme authority, lay or ecclesiastical; the chair of St. Patrick had for a century been in the hands of lay usurpers, until it came to be regarded as an hereditary dignity. What wonder if in these circumstances the bonds of morality were loosened, and abuses multiplied. And it was well that the prelates of Canterbury called attention to these excesses, although they were powerless to apply an effective remedy. That work was reserved for the great St. Malachy. We know from his life, written by St. Bernard, that at least the diocese of Down and Connor was then in a deplorable state, and that it was by his apostolic labours, and by the labours of the men whom he trained, that these grave abuses were corrected and strict discipline enforced.

Lanfranc died in 1089, but for four years the King kept the revenues of the See of Canterbury in his own hands, until at length Anselm with great reluctance was obliged to accept the primacy. Shortly after, in 1095, died the Bishop of Dublin, Donatus O'Haingly, who had succeeded Patrick (drowned in 1084), and was succeeded by his nephew Samuel O'Haingly. Lanfranc had consecrated Donatus in 1084, and given him on that occasion valuable gifts of books and vestments for the use of his Cathedral Church; so now also the new prelate-elect is sent to St. Anselm to receive episcopal consecration. This Samuel had been a monk of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Alban's, and we know from Eadmer's "*Vita Sancti Anselmi*," that "he was elected by Muiredach, King of Ireland (Mortogh O'Brien, successor of Turlough), and also by the clergy *and the people*—another remnant of a more ancient discipline." He adds, moreover, that "according to ancient custom, *juxta morem antiquum*, Samuel was sent by common accord, *cum communi decreto*, to be consecrated by Anselm. The ancient custom does not appear to have existed before the time of Lanfranc; so the phrase was probably somewhat a flourish of Eadmer's, to enhance the dignity of the See of Canterbury, and his beloved

friend and master, St. Anselm. This consecration of Samuel took place on the 20th of April, 1096, and, like his two predecessors, he made a profession of obedience to St. Anselm and to his successors.

We have a letter from Anselm, written shortly after, and sent through Malchus of Waterford to this Samuel, in which the Saint sharply reprehends him for alienating the books and vestments which Lanfranc had given to his uncle, the late Bishop. He commands him to make prompt restitution, as these gifts were given for the use of the Church; and he furthermore charges him with ejecting the monks from their monastery, and having the assurance to have the Cross carried before him—a privilege, he says, reserved for Archbishops who had received the pallium. Clearly, Anselm was determined to exercise this jurisdiction over the Danish Bishops of Dublin, Waterford, and Limerick.¹

Towards the end of 1096, a letter was sent to Anselm by several Irish princes and prelates, requesting him to consecrate as prelate one Malchus, whom they had chosen for the Danish city of Waterford. This document clearly proves that the primacy of Canterbury over the Danish cities was generally recognised. The address was—"Anselmo. . . . clerus et populus oppidi Waterfordiae cum rege Murchertacho, et episcopo Dofnaldo salutem in Domino," and the letter was signed after this fashion:—

Ego Murchertachus rex Hiberniae Subscripsi.

Ego Dermuth dux frater regis, S.S.

Ego Dofnaldus (*i.e.* Domnaldus), S.S.

Ego Idunan episopus Midiae, S.S.

Ego Samuel Dublinensis (not Dunelmensis), S.S.

Ego Ferdumnachus Lageniensium epis., S.S.

Many other signatures followed. Malchus was accordingly consecrated by Anselm in January, 1097. There can be little doubt that "Dofnaldus," here mentioned, is the same name and the same person as "Domnaldus," to whom

¹We do not know who consecrated Gillebert, first Bishop of the Osmen of Limerick; but Patrick his successor was certainly consecrated in 1140 by Ralph of Canterbury.

Lanfranc had written years before, and who was now an old man in his 68th year.

When Malchus of Waterford was returning from England, he seems to have carried letters from Anselm to Mortogh O'Brien, the "glorious King" of Ireland, in which he duly lauds his kingly virtues, and then implores him to correct the abuses prevalent in his dominions. He repeats the charges already made by Lanfranc: *dicitur enim quod viri ita libere et publice uxores suas uxoribus aliorum commutant sicut quilibet equum equo, aut pro libitu et sine ratione relinquunt.* He also repeats the charge of bishops having been ordained like simple priests, by only one prelate, and some of them having no fixed dioceses. An attempt was made in 1111, and again in 1118, to remedy this abuse, by fixing and limiting the various dioceses in the several provinces. Anselm, later on, addressed another letter to the king on the same subject, referring to these same abuses, and earnestly beseeching him to endeavour to provide a remedy. Malchus, Bishop of Waterford, who, in his youth had been a monk of Winchester, and whom the Saint addressed as his friend and fellow-bishop, seems to have been his principal informant in reference to the contents of the above letters. Mortogh O'Brien also, then the most powerful prince in Ireland, seems to have secured the esteem of St. Anselm. The Saint is evidently sincere in the laudations which he bestows upon him, and seems to have befriended him on several occasions. There is a short letter in the series addressed by Mortogh to the Saint, in which he thanks Anselm for the many kindnesses he had done to his son-in-law, Arnulf or Ernulphus Montgomer; and the king also thanks him for his prayers, and declares his readiness to serve Anselm by every means in his power, as in duty bound to do. The king was, indeed, very intimately connected with the Northmen in Ireland, England, and Norway. He was three times proclaimed King of Dublin, one of his daughters was married to the eldest son of Magnus, King of Norway; another to that Arnulph already mentioned, the eldest son of the Count of Surrey and Arundel, one of the first of the Norman nobles.

This connection will serve to explain the frequent and

cordial intercourse between Anselm and Mortogh O'Brien, which is highly creditable to both parties. And as the Dalcassian Princes were, at least nominally, the supreme rulers during this period of the three Danish cities, it will serve to explain how it came to pass that they and the prelates under their influence readily consented to permit the people and clergy of these cities to send their prelates-elect to Canterbury for consecration. But there is no evidence that the Archbishops of Canterbury ever exercised, or indeed ever claimed to exercise, either primatial or legatine jurisdiction over any single one of the episcopal sees of Celtic Ireland. And even before the advent of the Normans, their claim to primacy over the Danish cities was practically extinguished by the grant of the four pallia at the Synod of Kells, in 1152, to the four Metropolitan Sees of Armagh, Cashel, Dublin, and Tuam.

PELAGIANISM IN THE EARLY BRITISH AND IRISH CHURCHES.

It has long been the boast of Irish Catholics that their ancient Church was never tainted by heresy. We had in Ireland no heresiarchs, no heresies of native growth. In later times the upas tree was transplanted into this country, but it was of foreign origin ; it never took kindly to the soil, its life was always precarious and artificial. There are, however, certain statements advanced by some writers regarding the existence of the Pelagian heresy in the early British and Irish Churches, which seem to conflict with our pretensions to immunity from every form of error. We propose to submit these statements to examination with a view to admit them in so far as they are shown to be true, and reject them in so far as they are proved to be false or groundless.

In the first place it has been admitted by Usher, Lanigan, and others, on the authority of St. Jerome, that Cælestius, the associate and intimate friend of Pelagius, was an Irishman. It is not difficult to show that this opinion is founded on a misinterpretation of the language of St. Jerome.

It is admitted on all hands that Pelagius was a Briton, and that to the British Church belongs the doubtful honour of having produced this subtle and dangerous heresiarch. His great opponent, St. Augustine, frequently speaks of him as a Briton.¹ St. Prosper² of Aquitaine, who continued the war against him after the death of Augustine, describes him in one place as a *British snake* ; and in another he speaks of him as *nurtured by the sea-girt Britons* ; elsewhere he describes Britain as the *native land* of the Pelagian heresy, which is only true in so far as it gave birth to Pelagius. Marius Mercator,³ a contemporary writer and vigorous champion of orthodoxy, describes the first author of Pelagianism as a

¹ *Epist.* 186, No. 1.

² *Carmina.*

³ *Commonitorium.*

Syrian named Rufinus, who, too cunning to expose himself to danger, imbued with his errors the "British Monk," Pelagius, through whom he propagated his doctrine. The British origin of Pelagius is also asserted by Orosius,¹ Gennadius,² Bede,³ and several other writers.

What is most important is the testimony of Jerome himself, who, in two passages, refers to the author of the Pelagian heresy, without, however, mentioning his name. In the first he describes him in very strong language as an ignorant calumniator,⁴ filled with *Scotch porridge*—*Scottorum pulitibus praegravatus*—who was the agent of Grunnius in writing defamatory letters against Jerome. In another passage he adds that (Grunnius) "though silent himself, barks by the mouth of the Alban dog, a corpulent and unwieldy brute, better able to kick than bite, who derives his origin from the Scottish nation in the neighbourhood of Britain."⁵ Many writers think that the reference in these passages is to Cælestius through whom the arch-heretic Pelagius propagated his errors, and hence they infer that Cælestius was of *Scottish*, that is, of Irish origin.

There are many reasons against this view, which is now pretty generally rejected. A close examination of the three or four Prefaces to his Commentaries on Jeremias, written about 416, in which St. Jerome makes these references, will, we think, clearly show that the silent instigator was Rufinus of Aquileia, and his disciple Pelagius was the Alban dog filled with Scotch porridge. The whole context fits in with this view. Grunnius was a nick-name often given to Rufinus by St. Jerome during their long and bitter disputes about the errors of Origen. In the first Preface he speaks of Grunnius as the master, and Pelagius as the disciple, through whom were scattered biblical letters, and calumnious references to his (Jerome's) teaching. Pelagius certainly was an able Scriptural commentator. He wrote several letters and

¹ *Apologia*.

² *Libro. Eccles. Scrip.*

³ Lib. I., c. 10.

⁴ Praef. Lib. I. *In Jeremiam*.

⁵ Ipse mutus latrat per Albinum (in some MSS. Alpinum.) canem grandem et corpulentum, et qui calcibus majis saevire posset quam dentibus; habet enim progeniem Scotticae gentis de Brittanorum vicinia. Praef. in Lib. III. *In Jeremiam*.

treatises—some of them are extant—in which he put forward his own views and attacked St. Jerome. He was, too, as we know from Orosius and others, a large and well-fed man, very different in appearance from the lean and half-starved saint, who upbraids him with his huge bulk and partiality for porridge, which we may fairly assume to have been then, as now, rather a national than personal characteristic.

It is true, indeed, that Rufinus had been at this time four or five years dead, but it is equally true that St. Jerome did not spare him even after his death, for elsewhere he describes “The Scorpion as buried in Sicilian soil between Enceladus and Porphyry.”¹ Indeed Jerome himself implies, that Rufinus was then dead—*ipse mutus*, he says, *ipse licet*, but he contends that he lives in his disciple Pelagius, who breathes his spirit and inherits his doctrine; for he describes Pelagianism as a branch of Origenism—*ramusculus Origenis*—taught by Rufinus and, as he insinuates, propagated by his disciple Pelagius.

How, then, it may be asked, could Pelagius have been at once a Briton and a Scot? St. Jerome does not say he was a Scot, but that he was of Scottish origin, which is a very different thing, and was true of very many of the most famous saints of Wales and Strathclyde—they were born in Britain, but were of Scotch, that is, Irish origin. We know, too, that even at this early period—for Pelagius must have been born about 370—the Irish Scots had established themselves in many places on the western coast of England from the Clyde to the Severn, and it is not unlikely that the young Briton of Scottish origin got his early education in the neighbourhood of Glastonbury, which seems to have been the earliest and most famous Christian school in Britain.

Everything that we know of Pelagius and Cælestius fits in with this theory. The latter was of noble birth, probably a Gaul, or Italian, but, being from infancy a eunuch, he spent his youth in a monastery, whence, as Gennadius tells us, he wrote three letters to his parents or friends, afterwards published in the form of a short treatise, and of great

¹ “Scorpius inter Enceladum et Porphyrium Trinacriae humo ponitur.”

utility to all those who are anxious to know God.¹ He afterwards became an advocate or *auditorialis scholasticus*, and was doubtless practising in the Roman courts when he happened to meet with Pelagius, probably about the year 400. Being a man of eloquence and courage, as well as great keenness in disputation—Augustine says he was *acerrimi ingenii*—Pelagius was very anxious to secure so able an assistant, and in a short time succeeded in firmly attaching the young and brilliant advocate to his own party. All this is inconsistent with his birth in Ireland at that early period—noble Christian parents, able to appreciate his spiritual writings; his youth spent in a monastery, an advocate at Rome, and that too some fifty years before St. Patrick landed in Ireland! The hypothesis is eminently improbable.

On the other hand, everything goes to confirm the statement that Pelagius was of British birth and Scottish origin. There were few, if any, Christians in Ireland between 300 and 370. Orosius² hints that Pelagius was of humble birth, and having no opportunity in his youth of receiving a liberal education, was compelled to have recourse to the assistance of others in the composition of his books. The latter part of this statement, however, must be received with caution. His extant works, and the language of his contemporaries, clearly show that Pelagius was an able man and a polished scholar. Before he became an open heretic he certainly enjoyed the reputation of being as virtuous as he was learned. Augustine declares that he heard him spoken of with much praise during the years of his stay in Rome, and that he was admitted by all who knew him to be a holy man, like the other opponents of grace, he adds, who lived in continence, and were praiseworthy for their good works. Paulinus of Nola, himself a most holy and amiable man, esteemed Pelagius as a "distinguished servant of God." Pope Zozimus, in his letter to the African prelates, who had condemned the doctrine of Pelagius, spoke of him, as "a layman of fair fame in the service of God."

But when he persisted in his erroneous doctrines we find

¹ "Omni Deum desideranti necessarius."

² *Apol.* c. 26.

very different language used by his opponents. No one, indeed, could upbraid him with incontinency ; but Orosius, whom St. Augustine had requested to watch him, during his sojourn in Palestine, about 415, describes him as a huge Goliath, confident in his carnal strength, strutting about in fine apparel, with a huge head, thick neck, and broad shoulders, more like a giant than a monk. Then he alludes to some deformity, on account of which he calls him *mutilus*, and seems to imply that he was awkward in gait and blind of one eye. He adds, that Pelagius was a vagabond monk, going about to various monasteries to ascertain what cheer each might afford ; fond of good living, given overmuch to eating, drinking, and sleeping ; but not at any rate uncleanly in his habits, for he reproaches him with being fond of baths as well as of banquets.

Yet the Pelagian heresy did not originate with Pelagius ; and Prosper could more truthfully ascribe its origin to Syria than to Britain. St. Jerome was doubtless quite right in speaking of Origenism as the parent tree which produced Pelagianism as well as many other heresies. The school of Antioch was more or less infected with the doctrines of Origen's *First Principles* ; and hence we find Theodore of Mopsuestia, John of Jerusalem, Cassian of Marseilles, who was educated in Syria, all more or less favourable to the doctrine of Pelagius. Theodore of Mopsuestia was certainly an able and learned man, as his writings abundantly prove ; there can be no doubt, however, that both his writings and his great influence, during his long episcopacy, were adverse to orthodoxy, especially on the great questions connected with the Incarnation and with Grace. Marius Mercator declares that it was the Syrian Rufinus who first brought Pelagianism to Rome ; and we have seen that St. Jerome charges Rufinus of Aquileia with deriving the same error from the writings of Origen, and indoctrinating Pelagius with his own views. The Syrian school was, in truth, somewhat rationalistic ; it was anxious to minimise the mysteries of Christianity, and reconcile them, as far as possible, with the philosophy of Alexandria. Pelagianism could never have originated in a British monastery ; the Britons had not theology enough

to err on the questions of Grace. Rufinus of Aquileia, and his namesake of Syria, brought it to Rome, and by the agency of Pelagius infected various churches throughout Christendom.

It would seem that Pelagius made his appearance at Rome about 400. St. Augustine says he lived there for a long time, and is supposed to have taught a school in the city. About the year 405, St. Chrysostom, in his exile, complains of the defection from his own supporters of the monk Pelagius ; which statement, if it refer to the heresiarch, would seem to imply that at that time he was known and esteemed by the Saint of Constantinople, where he might have gone to learn the Greek language, with which we know for certain that he was familiar. Before his departure from Rome in 410, when Alaric laid siege to the city, he had published commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, in which, for the first time, on the famous passage in the *Romans* v. 12, he gave public expression to his views. He had already acquired great influence in the city ; for, as Augustine says, he was learned and acute, and his letters were read by many persons for the sake of their eloquence and pungency—*propter acrimoniam et facundiam*. We have a very favourable specimen still remaining in the epistle to the noble lady Demetrias, equally remarkable for her virtues as for her wealth and intelligence. Augustine found it necessary to caution her against the snares of Pelagius, and whoever reads this letter will readily admit that a caution was by no means unnecessary, for, in language graceful and elegant, he conveys excellent rules for the practical guidance of devout souls, just barely flavoured with the views of his dangerous and subtle heresy, so flattering to the instincts of noble and generous natures.

We cannot stay to speak of the condemnation of Cælestius in Africa, and Pelagius in Rome. In spite of every subterfuge—mainly through the efforts of St. Augustine—the true character of the new doctrine was soon ascertained, their errors were formally condemned both by the Popes Zozimus and Innocent, and the heretics themselves expelled both from Rome and Constantinople. We are unfortunately unacquainted with their subsequent fate, and the time or place of their death.

When Pelagianism was expelled from Rome and Constantinople, it took refuge in the provinces, especially in Gaul and Britain. The learned and amiable Cassian, by birth a Scythian, was trained in his youth in one of the monasteries around Bethlehem, and, after spending some years amongst the Egyptian eremites in the practice of all virtues, had established himself, about 415, in Marseilles, where he founded the famous Monastery of St. Victor. The fame of his learning and sanctity soon attracted crowds of religious men to the new institute. St. Victor's became a centre of religious life and literary culture for Southern Gaul. During the Pelagian controversy Cassian seems to have taken no active part in the fierce conflict between error and orthodoxy then raging both in the East and West. But after the expulsion of Pelagius and Cælestius, about the year 426, at the earnest request of St. Honoratus and Vincent of Lerins, Cassian published for the use of the monks of Lerins, a collection of Conferences on religious subjects, most of which he had prepared for the instruction of the monks with whom he had been sojourning in Egypt.

In these Conferences, especially in the thirteenth, and to a less extent in the third, the learned and pious author broached those errors which were afterwards known as semi-pelagianism. The monks of St. Victor's, too, pretended to be greatly scandalised at some of the expressions used by St. Augustine in his works against the Pelagians, which in their opinion were destructive of human liberty, and inevitably led to the errors of the Predestinarians.

Just at this period St. Prosper was forced to leave Aquitaine and seems to have established himself in Provence. Prosper, though a layman—he certainly was not a priest—was one of the most accomplished and energetic defenders of Grace, as well as an ardent admirer of St. Augustine, with whom he frequently corresponded. He brought the complaints of the French monks under the notice of the Saint, who vindicates his own doctrine against the Massilienses in his treatise, *De Correptione et Gratia*. Augustine died shortly after, in 430, whereupon his opponents in Gaul became still more clamorous against the dead lion, and

Prosper, proceeding to Rome, brought the conduct of the monks and bishops of Gaul under the notice of Pope Celestine, who, in 431, wrote letters to these prelates, in which, without justifying every expression used by St. Augustine, he vindicates the orthodox character of his teaching, and imposes silence on his calumniators.

But Prosper was not content with this authoritative pronouncement in favour of his master. He boldly entered the lists against the Author of the *Conferences* and attacked his doctrine on Grace in the well-known treatise, *Contra Collatorem*, published about 433.

In this work, Prosper, speaking of Pope St. Celestine, says, that "with no less watchful care he freed the *Britains* from the same taint of (the Pelagian) heresy when he excluded from that remote ocean-land certain enemies of Grace who took possession of the soil of their origin; and by ordaining a bishop for the Scots, while striving to keep the Roman island (of Britain) Catholic, he made the barbarous island (of Ireland) Christian."¹ This reference to the ordination of Palladius by St. Celestine for the conversion of Ireland is important, because it proves conclusively that another reference by the same author to this country, as printed in Migne's *Patrology*, page 1753, vol. XLV., is corrupt. According to the reading given there, Prosper, in his *Chronicle* under date of 429, is represented as saying that "in the Consulate of Florentius and Dionysius, Agricola, a Pelagian, son of Severian, also a Pelagian, corrupted by his teaching the Churches of *Ireland*; ² but St. Celestine, at the instigation of the deacon Palladius, sent St. Germanus of Auxerre, to drive out the heretics from the *Britains* and bring them back to the faith." This reading of *Hiberniæ* instead of *Britanniæ*,³ although found in a few inferior MSS. is clearly corrupt, as the context itself and the testimony of the same Prosper in the treatise, *Contra Collatorem*, abundantly prove. It was

¹ "Ordinato Scotis episcopo dum Romanam insulam studet servare Catholicam fecit etiam barbaram Christianam." c. 21, Lib. *Contra Col.*

² "Agricola Pelagianus Severiani Pelagiani filius ecclesias Hiberniæ dogmatis sui insinuatione corrupit," etc., etc.

³ In Migne's Edition of the works of St. Prosper it is correctly printed *Britanniæ*.

England, not Ireland, that was then infected with Pelagianism, and the same Pontiff who kept one Catholic by expelling heresy, made the other Christian by sending Palladius, and after him, St. Patrick, to preach the Gospel in this country.

This mission of Germanus to Britain is interesting to us because, according to many ancient authorities,¹ St. Patrick accompanied and aided him in the work. Germanus had been for many years the "tutor" of St. Patrick, it was under him our Apostle is said to have studied the "canons," and from the bright example of Germanus Patrick learned the lessons of virtue and mortification which he was destined in after years to teach in Ireland.

The description of the life of Germanus, given by his biographer, Constantius, is truly marvellous. He had been a soldier and a statesman, but sold all his property when he became a bishop, and gave the price to the poor or the Church. His food was the coarsest barley bread, vegetables, and a little milk, but neither wine, oil or vinegar. His only clothing, alike in winter and summer, was a single tunic over a hair shirt; his bed was made of planks, strewn with cinders; his covering at night was an old sack; he had no pillow for his head, and spent more of the night time in prayers and tears than in slumber.

Such was the man under whom St. Patrick spent many years of his life, probably the greater part of the eleven years that intervened between 418, when Germanus became bishop, and 429, when St. Celestine sent him to England.

It was very natural that St. Patrick should accompany him, for he was not only a favourite disciple of Germanus during the years he spent in the monastery, which the Saint had built beyond the river in view of his own episcopal city of Auxerre, he was, moreover, by birth a Briton. More than once he seems to have visited his relations "in the Britains,"² and hence St. Germanus would naturally take Patrick along with him on a mission which was likely to be difficult and dangerous.

¹ See the Scholiast on St. Fiacc's *Life of St. Patrick*.

² The Britains—Brittanie—at that period included all the western coast of England and Scotland from the Clyde to the Severn.

And it was a providential circumstance that St. Patrick should witness the Apostolic visitation of the British Church by Germanus before undertaking his own mission, and thus acquire practical experience under so able a master, of the power of truth, the wiles of heresy, and the visible assistance which God lends to those who fight His battles.

The mission was eminently successful. We have an account of the miraculous voyage and of the preaching of St. Germanus in Bede, who himself extracted it textually from the Saint's life, written by Constantius, a nearly contemporary author. It is evident from this account that the British, or rather the Welsh Church at this time was in a very deplorable state from the ravages of heresy; but the learning, the eloquence, and the miracles of St. Germanus completely silenced the heretics and saved the Church of the Britains. It was probably after returning from Wales in 431, that Germanus, hearing of the death of Palladius, whom the Pope had sent to Ireland, resolved on sending his own disciple Patrick to Rome in order to receive the same Apostolic commission which Palladius had already received. We are told that Germanus sent St. Patrick to Rome, accompanied by one of his own priests named Segetius, who was to testify to the Pope concerning his character and qualifications. Thereupon St. Celestine, when assured of the death of Palladius, in the spring of 432, had St. Patrick consecrated, and sent him to accomplish the difficult and dangerous task vainly undertaken by Palladius. There could be no Pelagian heresy therefore in Ireland before St. Patrick, and it is not likely that he, the pupil and companion of the great Germanus, would tolerate its introduction into Ireland during all the long and fruitful years of his Irish Apostolate. Yet it was necessary for our Saint to be perpetually on his guard against the introduction of this same subtle and dangerous error. Heresy was still lurking in the Welsh Church, and it was necessary for St. Germanus, this time accompanied by Severus of Treves, to make, in 446, a second missionary voyage to Wales in order to repress the spread of Pelagianism. Again he checked, but did not succeed in finally eradicating, the disease. This task was not accomplished until many

years later by the great St. David of Menevia. He is said to have held two Synods, one the famous Synod of Brevy in 519, where in public disputation he gained a signal victory over the Sectaries, who were present in great force. Later on, in 529, he seems to have given Pelagianism its *coup de grace* in another Synod, which he is said to have held at Caerleon, at which some Irish saints, of whom there were many then sojourning in Wales, in all probability assisted.

During these very years when Pelagianism still infected the Britains, there was frequent intercourse between the Welsh and the infant Irish Church : many of the new priesthood in Ireland came from Britain ; the incursions of the Picts and Saxons no doubt drove others to take refuge in Ireland, so that it is not impossible that in spite of the vigilance of St. Patrick, some persons more or less tinged with Pelagianism may have found their way to Ireland, and tried to introduce their errors. It is certain, too, as we know from the 32nd Canon of the Synod of St. Patrick, Auxilius and Iserninus, which was held not later than 460, the year in which Auxilius died, that our Apostle found it necessary to forbid any of these vagabond Welsh clerics to exercise their functions in Ireland without testimonial letters from their own prelates.¹

We have no positive proof, however, of any kind that at this early period the taint of Pelagianism extended from Wales to Ireland. Not so later on.

After a vacancy of the Apostolic See for two stormy and turbulent years, Pope Severinus was elected on the 29th of May, 640. But he had only reigned two months and four days when his death caused a new vacancy which continued until the election of John IV., in December of the same year. It seems, that during the brief Pontificate of Severinus, letters were received in Rome from a number of Irish ecclesiastics asking for practical guidance on some very important points. In consequence, however, of the sudden death of the Pope, these letters had remained for some time unanswered, at least the answer, if written, was not forwarded to Ireland. After the election, however, but before the

¹ " Clericus qui de Brittanis ad nos venit sine epistola, etsi habitet in lebe, non licitum ministrare."

consecration of John, which latter event seems to have taken place on Christmas Eve, 640, the Pope-elect and several of the Roman clergy sent an answer to Ireland, in which several severe charges are made against at least a portion of the Irish Church. Unfortunately we do not possess the entire document, but we know from the extract preserved in Bede, that the Roman clergy accused the Irish ecclesiastics of "renewing the old heresy of the Quarto-decimans by celebrating the Pasch with the Hebrews on the fourteenth day of the moon"—a charge certainly unfounded, and which goes to show, what indeed might naturally be expected, that the Roman authorities were not well acquainted with the actual discipline of the Northern Irish Church at this time. They differed, it is true, from the Romans as to the proper date of Easter, but they certainly never celebrated the Pasch except on a Sunday, and were not therefore Quarto-decimans of the heretical kind. Besides this disciplinary question, the Romans brought a still more serious charge against the Irish:—"We have also ascertained that the poison of the Pelagian heresy is *again* reviving amongst you;"¹ and they earnestly call upon the Irish prelates to take measures for the removal of that venomous superstition. The letter was written by the Archpriest Hilary, John the Deacon, Pope-elect, and two other Johns, one called the Primicerius, and the other the Consilarius of the Apostolic See, and it is addressed to "the most holy and beloved Thomian (the Primate), Columbanus (of Clonard), Cronan (Bishop of Lendrum in Ulster), Diman (of Connor), Baithan (probably of Tibohine, in the County Roscommon), and to Cronan, Ernan, Lasrian, Stellan (or Scellan) Segianus and Saran, as well as to the other Irish Abbots and Doctors." The five last mentioned were Abbots, of whom the most distinguished were Cronan, of Moville, Segianus, probably of Iona, and the last mentioned, Sarán, who is described as a Doctor or Theologian.

It will be observed that the most of these names represent ecclesiastics belonging to the northern part of Ireland which had not yet received the Roman discipline on the

¹ "Et hoc quoque cognovimus quod virus Pelagianae hereseos apud vos denuo reviviscit."

Paschal question ; and it is clear that the Roman authorities must have been informed in some way that Pelagianism was gaining ground in this country. The words *denuo reviviscit*, do not necessarily imply, as Lanigan remarks, that Pelagianism had previously infected any part of the Irish Church. For the *second* revival may have reference to its appearance in Ireland after its extinction elsewhere, although the expression naturally would imply a revival in Ireland, at least in the opinion of the Romans. But who were the informants who made in Rome this grave charge against the Irish Church ? Was it made by these prelates themselves in their letters to Rome, or by the prelates of the South who had previously received the Easter discipline which the Northerners declined to adopt ? We cannot say ; but in face of the emphatic statement of the Roman authorities—*we know this too*—it cannot, we think, be denied that there must have been at that time in the country some remnants of Pelagianism, derived in all probability from the neighbouring and friendly British Churches where that heresy lingered so long, and was uprooted with so much difficulty.

There is not a shadow of proof, however, from any other source of the existence of Pelagianism in Ireland, if we except one fact of doubtful authenticity to which we can only very briefly advert.

There is a Latin life of St. Killian, the Apostle of Franconia, published by Surius, tome iv., page 131. In this life it is stated that Killian presented himself before Pope Conon at Rome, about the year 687, in order to obtain due licence to preach, and to become acquainted with the entire Christian dogma.¹ This was necessary, because as the writer adds : “ *Hibernia olim Pelagiana foedata fuerit heresi ; Apostolicâque censurâ damnata, quae nisi Romano judicio solvi non poterat.* ” The writer of this life is unknown and the statement is manifestly inaccurate in so far as it implies that a Papal censure or interdict was laid on Ireland, from which it was necessary to get absolution in Rome. It seems the writer knew something of the letter from Rome

¹ “ *Ut integrum Christianae religionis dogma et facultatem praedicandi acciperet.* ”

in 640, to which we have already referred, and in all probability the Apostolic censure of which he speaks is the rebuke contained in that letter. Very naturally St. Killian went to Rome, as St. Patrick did before him, to get his mission to preach from the Pope. We may admit, too, that in consequence of the statements made in Rome regarding the Paschal controversy, the doctrine of the Irish Church had been somewhat suspected on certain points, but this writer who was evidently a foreigner, was scarcely warranted in using such strong language. We have undoubted evidence from various sources that the British Churches were deeply infected with the Pelagian poison, but there is no evidence, except that already referred to, that Ireland was so infected, and that evidence is, as we have seen, very meagre and unsatisfactory.

AN ISLAND SHRINE IN THE WEST.

ARDILAUN, more correctly Ard-Oilean, or High Island, is one of the most interesting of the many holy islands off the western coast of Ireland. There is another island of the same name in Lough Corrib, from which Sir Arthur E. Guinness takes his title of Baron Ardilaun; but the ocean island was practically unknown, except to the saints of old. It is situated about six miles south-and-by-west of Inisboffin, and about three miles off the extreme western point of Connemara, which is known as Aghros Point, and is about eleven Galway miles west of Clifden. Being so very remote and almost inaccessible, it has been very rarely visited by strangers; even the most enthusiastic antiquarians have shrunk from committing themselves to an open boat in these wild seas, and then scaling the perpendicular cliffs that rise all round the shores of the island.

We were enabled, not without some risk, to visit this singular, holy island in July, 1889; and we venture to hope that a brief account of such a sanctuary of ancient piety will prove of some interest to our readers. We made an early start from Clifden, on Monday morning, the 22nd of July, accompanied by our worthy host, Father Lynskey, the excellent pastor of Clifden, and his curate, Father Biggins, both well skilled in the colloquial Irish language, which is a matter of some importance for those who venture to explore these remote regions. The drive from Clifden to Omey Island lies along the northern shore of the long narrow inlet of Streamstown, and affords many picturesque views of the bold headland that runs from Clifden towards Omey Island, and overlooks all the hills and islands of these remotest shores. On arriving at Omey, which is about seven miles beyond Clifden, we drove across the strand that separates it from the mainland when the tide is out, and paid a visit to that island, which is very celebrated in connection with the history of St. Fechin.

The islanders of Omey told us that, as it was blowing a

stiff breeze from the north-west, it would be quite impossible to reach Ardilaun on such a day, and advised us not to make the attempt. However, the time at our disposal was limited ; we had come far to see this island shrine, and if it could not be reached in July, when could we hope to reach it ? So Father Lynskey resolved to drive on to Aghros-Beg, and see if the hardy fishermen of the ultimate west would venture to effect a landing on Ardilaun. Yes, they would ; the clergy were to be along with them, and they had nothing to fear. It would, no doubt, be a tough pull in the teeth of such a wind and such a sea ; but all would go well if we only kept steady and the men worked hard. Our crew consisted of six stalwart and good-humoured young fellows with bronzed faces, strong arms, and fearless hearts. Their good pastor had succeeded in getting a pier built for their boats, which before were often dashed to pieces on the rocks ; and if he asked them, I believe they would volunteer to take him all the way to America. The waves were much broken by the cross seas between the rocks and islands on this part of the coast, yet we shipped very little water, and slowly forged ahead in the very teeth of the wind and sea until we reached partial shelter under the lee of the Friar's Island, whose huge cliffs rise black and bare between Ardilaun and the mainland. The wash of the broken billows, however, compelled us to give the island a wide berth, although we were for a while actually under the shelter of its precipitous rocks. Then one more supreme effort was made to clear the half mile of open sea between the two islands, through which the wind and waves swept fiercely in from the north-west. The sweat rolled down in streams from the men's faces, yet still they bravely held by their oars, now in the trough of the sea, and the next moment on the very crest of the huge billows that rose so threateningly around us. No word was spoken, the men held their breath, and steadied their oars so as to catch the water at the proper moment, when the oars would help to balance the boat on the broken crests of the waves. After twenty minutes' hard exertion, we got over this bit of angry sea, and all felt a sense of relief as soon as we glided under the comparative shelter of the cliffs of the High Island.

It certainly well deserves the name. Is there any chance, we thought, of stepping on to that steep sea-wall, and then scaling these horrid rocks? How can the boat approach them even for an instant without being dashed to pieces? None of us was a novice at sea; but we all saw the difficulty of landing on the island; and even the skilled mariners, who live so much on these stormy waters, could not say for certain, until they reached a certain spot, whether it would be possible to land on the island or not. But they would soon tell us. We were now approaching the little cove in which alone we could hope to land with a westerly or north-westerly wind. It is at the eastern side of the island, and would certainly escape the observation of any persons who were not acquainted with the place. This little cove is very deep—the men told us it was fully twenty fathoms—and runs in under the shelter of a huge projecting cliff, which towers over it on the north, and thus somewhat shelters it from the broken waves. Not that we shall land, in the ordinary sense of our boat touching the shore—that would be quite impossible in these restless waters, bounded by these steep and rugged rocks. Experience has taught the Connemara fisherman how to effect his purpose in another way, and even allow his boat at the same time to take care of itself. He makes a rope fast to a huge stone, which he throws out from the stern into the sea, and which is heavy enough to hold his boat under a lee shore. Then he pays out the rope until the boat approaches near enough on the crest of a wave for an active man to jump ashore with another rope, to which a light anchor is made fast. This anchor he secures in the face of the rock as best he can, and then the boat rides securely between these two cables. By hauling the anchor line taut she may be brought close enough to the rock for the passengers to jump in, one by one; but when the strain is removed, she recedes from the shore, and rides securely by the stone anchor, which will not allow her to touch the rocks. It was thus we left our boat, riding safely on the waves without even one man to care her. It was not at all easy to scramble up the cliff, although here and there something like footprints were cut in the rock. But one of the men, having

reached the summit, assisted his next neighbour, and so on at the various stages of the ascent, until all had reached the summit in safety. A false step, however, and the climber would certainly glide down the face of the slanting rock into a boiling sea some twenty fathoms deep. He might then strike out for the boat or the mooring ropes ; but he had no other chance of escape.

The island is about a quarter of a mile in length, but not more than a furlong in average breadth. It contains an area of eighty-two statute acres covered with a beautiful sward of short green grass, so soft and so elastic that it feels under the foot like a velvet carpet or a spring mattress of woven wire. I never saw anywhere the soil covered with a softer and greener sod, or one richer with the fragrance of many odours. The rocks protrude in rounded eminences in two or three places, but the remaining part of the surface is gently undulating and covered with the same soft and fragrant turf even close to the edge of the cliff. The general level of the island is about 200 feet above the sea, and it is faced round by a wall of absolutely inaccessible cliffs, except at that point on the eastern shore where we landed with so much difficulty. When the wind blows from the south there is a similar little cove to the north of the same protruding cliff that sheltered our boat, where a landing can also be effected, but only in the calmest weather. On the north-western face of the island, which is exposed to all the fury of the Atlantic, the cliffs rise sheer from the waves, and actually overhang the sea at a height of nearly 300 feet in the highest points. The prospect from this portion of the island, looking to the north-west, is very grand and awe-inspiring. Boffin and Shark raise up their bare black outlines beyond the waves against the naked sky to the north ; to the west is the ultimate ocean which amongst these islands can hardly be said to be ever calm ; on the land side, the Twelve Pins of Connemara rise up in gloomy grandeur ; then, looking southward, beyond Cruagh Island may be seen the white breakers around Slyne Head lighthouse and the distant islands of Aran, and, on a clear day, Kerry Head and Brandon Hill rise up grandly from the sea on the extreme verge of the southern horizon. And

then the eye turns from all this savage grandeur of rocks and waves and mountains to repose with double pleasure on the vivid green of the soft turf beneath your feet.

Neither is all life wanting on this lonely island. It is true, there are no inhabitants in the island now ; but there is a great abundance of rabbits, and a small and hardy colony of sheep that are slung up the rocks to browse on the fragrant herbage, and whose flesh is so sweet, that it would be a luxury for an epicure. The gannet and the herring-gull and all the birds that haunt the desolate ocean islets are here, too, in abundance. But of man, at present, there is no trace, except a solitary roofless house, long ago built to shelter the miners, who sank a shaft in search of silver and copper ore ; which, however, appear to have disappointed their expectations, for both house and mine have been long abandoned by the workmen.

What renders this island specially interesting is its ecclesiastical ruins, which, in all probability, date from the sixth century. We shall here describe them exactly as we saw them. We first came to a holy well at the foot of a ledge of rock, which rises above the green sward of the island. It is surrounded by a rude stone wall, and close at hand was a flag sculptured with a plain Celtic cross of the most ancient type. The flag was probably used to cover the well ; but it was broken either by the miners or some vandal visitors, who had no reverence for holy things. The well itself is called "Tubber Brian Murrogh," according to some of the fishermen ; but others declared that it was "St. Brian Boru's Well." It is on the south-eastern part of the island, and about 100 paces from the bee-hive cells and the cashel that enclosed them. The water is of a tea-colour, probably owing to the presence of peat ; but it is sweet and pleasant to the taste. O'Flaherty, describing this island, says : "It is inaccessible but on calm settled weather, and so steep that it is hard after landing in it to climb to the top, where there is a well called Brian Boramy (King of Ireland) his well, and a standing water, on the brook whereof was a mill." ¹ The standing water is there still, and the brook still bears its surplus flood to the

¹ See *West Connaught*, page 115.

edge of the precipice, over which it pours its stream into a deep black pool walled in by cliffs more than 150 feet in height. The sea below is as deep beneath the surface as these giant walls of rock rise above it, so that the aspect of the spot is at once terrible and grand. Boats rarely ever venture into the recesses of these stormy ocean halls. It is still called in Irish *Cuan maillin*, or the mill-cove, because the mill-stream poured down its steep flanks into the sea. The stream itself is not more than fifty yards in length from the lakelet to the edge of the cliff. The place where the mill-wheel turned can still be traced, and although in summer it was a tiny stream, no doubt the frequent rains of the West always supplied the monks with abundant water to grind their corn. The lakelet is evidently of natural not artificial formation; it seems, too, to be of considerable depth, and contains some fish, which was doubtless one of the reasons that caused the island to be chosen as a hermitage by the saints of old.

On the margin of the lake, under a rising ground that sheltered the spot from the cold winds of the north-east, the monastic buildings were situated. They were all built of flat stones, without mortar; but both buildings and enclosure are now completely ruined. Enough, however, remains to determine their nature and extent. They were of the same general character as the ecclesiastical ruins that are still to be seen on so many of the islands of the West. There was the rectangular oratory, the cloghauns or bee-hive cells, and the enclosing cashel; which last, however, was little needed, for nature's rampart was all round about them; and, even if some marauders were bold enough to scale the cliffs at the landing-place, it would not be difficult to defend the monastery itself. It was admirably situated for that purpose, under a cliff that sheltered and defended it on the east; to the south was the lake; on the west and north-west the mill-stream and the sea-cliffs cut off all approach; so that a few resolute men could have held it against a host.

The cashel was 35 yards by 26; the oratory, near its centre, was 21 feet by 12, in the clear. There are remains of three cloghauns: one of which, still nearly perfect, has thick

walls, square within, but circular on the outside, and it is an excellent and well-built example of its class ; the second is unroofed, but the walls remain ; only the doorway of the third can now be observed—it was close to the oratory on the east. The western gable of the oratory is still nearly perfect ; the stones were small and flat. The doorway had a horizontal lintel, with very slightly inclining jambs ; but the masonry seems to have been of a rather inferior character. The native rock is not the granitic felspar and quartz of the mainland, but seems rather to be a hard mica slate, easily split up into flags. The eastern gable of the oratory is now entirely destroyed, and its stones scattered about. One cell stood at the east end of the oratory, the two others were near its north-east angle, but apparently outside the cashel. A little mortar seems to have been used in the heart of the wall of the oratory ; but none was used in building the cashel or the cells. Some 40 yards from the cashel, on the north, there is another awful sea-cove or pool, appropriately called *Dubh-linn*, or “ The Black-pool.” It is of a still deeper and wilder character than that into which the mill-stream pours its waters, and rendered the monastery absolutely unapproachable on the north and west. Between the cashel and this Black-pool there are traces of another building, which was probably a guest-house for the reception of strangers—it is no longer possible to determine its exact character or extent.

Slyne Head and its lighthouse, with all the sea-worn islets that surround it, can be distinctly seen from the cashel, about eight miles due south ; and it forms a very striking object in the distance. A little to the left, but close at hand, rise up, bold and bare, the rugged outlines of Cruach, or “ The Stack Island.” O’Flaherty calls it Cruagh-ar-ni-may, and Sir James Ware names it *Insula Cuniculorum*—it was so fruitful of rabbits ; but it was fatal to dogs, which either “ dye on the spot, or shortly after coming out of it.” The rabbits are there still ; but we did not hear that it is still “ a bane to dogs,” as the old historian of Iar Connaught describes it.

We found no inscribed stones on the island, although it

was alleged by the men that there were some to be seen there a short time previous. There are traces still discernible of the monks' garden, and what seems to have been an ancient graveyard, on the eastern shore of the smaller lake, between it and the cliffs. Of course, if the monks had a mill, they doubtless raised, as well as ground, their own corn, in the sheltered nooks on the south-eastern arm of the island. On the western and north-western slopes no crops could live, if the sea-breezes blew of old, as they do now, over the island. O'Flaherty says that, in his own time, there was "extant a chapel and a large round wall [the cashel enclosure]; and, also, that kind of stone building called cloghaun. Therein, too, yearly, an eyrie of hawks is found." We believe they breed there still; although the boatmen were not quite certain on this point.

But who were the holy men who dwelt in these little cells, and prayed in that poor oratory, surrounded by these awful precipices and that ever-restless ocean? It is not unlikely that this island was the one referred to in *The Navigation of St. Brendan*, as the first of the many strange islands discovered by that daring sailor-saint. When he had been many days at sea, and his supply of provisions was well-nigh consumed, Brendan and his monks, we are told, saw an island towards the north, which was very high and rocky—"valde saxosa et alta." And, as they approached the shore, they saw that it was exceedingly lofty, and straight as a wall; and they saw streams flowing down the cliffs into the sea; but they could find no port to bring their vessel alongside. Now, the monks being almost famished with hunger and thirst, eagerly sought to catch in their vessels a little of the water, as it fell from the cliffs; but the blessed Brendan rebuked them, and bade them wait until God would show them a landing-place, and some means of refreshing their wearied limbs. It was not, however, until they had several times sailed round the island that God showed them, on the third day, a narrow cove for landing, which was only large enough to admit a single vessel. Then Brendan rose up and blessed the narrow entrance, and found that it was cut into a rock, which rose up on either side like

a wall, but yet gave them a means of reaching the summit.¹ All this is an exact description of what we ourselves saw at Ardilaun; and there is probably no other island in the North Atlantic Ocean of which it is equally true. What follows belongs entirely to the marvellous and supernatural, but certainly is not uninteresting. The writer of the voyage, describes how, when the Saint and his companions walked along the shore, a dog came to meet Brendan, as if he were his master, and then led him and his companions, by a certain pathway, to a "town," into which they entered. And, lo! they found a large room prepared for their reception, with seats and couches, and water to wash their feet.

Now, as soon as they were seated, Brendan warned his monks not to touch anything without permission, as he feared that one, who was more greedy than the other brethren, might be tempted by all the fine things that they saw around them; for the walls were hung with curiously-wrought vessels of various metals, and also with bits and reins, and drinking-horns mounted with silver. After a little, Brendan seeing no one, and being very hungry, said to the brother who used to wait at table: "Bring us the dinner, which God has sent us;" and the brother rising up found a table close at hand prepared for dinner, with napkins, and loaves of wondrous whiteness—one for each of the company—and fishes also in abundance. Then Brendan blessed the table, whilst the brethren all joyfully partook of the food prepared for them, and gave thanks to God. After their meal they lay down on the couches to rest their limbs, tired from the toils of the sea, and slept soundly.

Now, whilst they were sleeping, Brendan rose up to pray, and he saw the devil, in the shape of an Ethiopian boy, take one of the silver-mounted bits from the wall, and give it to the greedy brother, who immediately concealed it in his bosom. But when morning was come, Brendan awoke the brethren to prepare and continue their voyage; and once more they found the table ready, and an abundant meal prepared for all. At their departure the holy man once more cautioned them not to touch anything beyond what God

¹ *Navigatio Brendani*, cap. iii.

had given them, and all promised to obey. "Ah!" said Brendan, "one of you has in his bosom a silver bit, which the devil gave him last night." The wretched man there-upon confessed his sin, and threw himself at the feet of Brendan, imploring pardon for his crime. Then the holy man visibly expelled the demon, before them all, from the penitent sinner; but the Saint at the same time told him to prepare to receive the Viaticum, for that his death was nigh, as a penalty for his sin. And so he died, and was buried on the island; but his soul was carried to heaven by the angels of God. Then the Saint re-embarked with his companions; and as they were setting out there came to the shore a young man, but they knew not whence he came, who gave them a basket of bread and a jar of water, to be their food on the sea until Pentecost; and so they departed from the High Island.

There may have been hermits living on this island at the time of St. Brendan's voyage, about A.D. 540; but it was, as O'Flaherty tells us, St. Fechin and his monks who founded the "abbey" on Ardilaun, the remains of which are still visible there.

This saint flourished during the first half of the seventh century, for his death is noticed in A.D. 664. He was a native of Bile, in the County of Sligo, but in the spirit of missionary enterprise, so characteristic of our early Irish saints, he preached the Gospel and founded monasteries in various remote parts of the country, especially at Fore, in Westmeath, and at Terron-fechin, in the County Louth. It was probably at the request of King Guaire that he undertook the conversion of the pagan inhabitants who still lingered in some of those remote islands of the West, especially in the island of Omey. And it was, doubtless, with a view to his own greater seclusion that he betook himself from Omey to Ardilaun, and there founded the oratory and the bee-hive cells which we have been describing. After his own departure for Meath, it is quite clear that Ardilaun still continued to be the penitential retreat of his disciples. We find, however, no reference made to any of his successors until A.D. 1017, when, according to *The Four Masters*,

Gormhgal of Ard-Oilean, chief *anmchara* of Ireland, died. O'Flaherty describes him as "a very spirituell person of renowned sanctity, who made in this island his hermitical retirement."

Besides Gormhgal, Colgan gives the names of the following saints as interred in Ardilaun:—Maelsuthunius, Celecharius, Tressachus, Dubthacus, Dundach, Cellochus, Ultanus Cormacchus, Conmachus. But it is quite evident that Colgan mistook Ardilaun for Inishere, the eastern of the three Isles of Aran; for it is in Inishere, not in Ardilaun, that all those holy men, with the exception of St. Gormhgal, are buried.

Mr. G. H. Kinahan, read a paper before the Royal Irish Academy, in 1869, in which he gives a short account of the ancient buildings on the island, as they appeared at the time of his visit. He also gives an excellent sketch-plan of the south western extremity of the island, in which the monastic ruins are situated. It is quite evident from a comparison of Mr. Kinahan's account with the present state of these ancient buildings, that the ruins have suffered much within the last twenty years. The island abounds in rabbits, which naturally take refuge in the old walls. When the shepherd boys, who occasionally visit the island, hunt these rabbits they frequently tear down the old walls to come at their game; and there is at present no one to prevent them from rooting up these venerable structures as much as they please. It is greatly to be regretted that the ruins of this island were not taken charge of by the Board of Works, as the present proprietors seem to be utterly indifferent about them, regarding them, doubtless, as nothing better than mere heaps of old stones.

We cannot, however, agree with all Mr. Kinahan's conclusions, in his brief but interesting paper.

His plan shows at least three gates in the original cashel. There possibly may have been two—one at the south-western, and the other at the south-eastern angle adjoining the lake. But neither in this nor any similar structure that we have seen, will the most careful inquiry show more than two gates; and, generally speaking, they will be found at opposite points of the enclosure—one for ordinary use, and the other, probably, for escape in case of sudden attack.

Again, Mr. Kinahan's plan shows three of the cloghauns as outside the monastic enclosure. It may be assumed with perfect certainty, that if they were really outside the cashel, they were not cloghauns or monastic cells, in the ordinary acceptation of the word. It appears to us quite clear that these three cells were built adjoining the wall or the enclosure, probably for want of space within it, but in such a way that the entrance to the cell opened on the enclosure, and practically formed a part of it. And the peculiar feature in these cells, not clearly brought out by Mr. Kinahan, is, that they were square or rectangular within, with a dome-shaped roof, but outside they were certainly circular, so far as we can judge from the one whose walls are still in a fair state of preservation. It would seem that St. Fechin and his monks, though for convenience sake they adopted the rectangular shape within, were yet unwilling to discard the traditional form of the bee-hive cell which was handed down to them by their sainted masters of the sixth century.

We think, too, that the building marked No. 1 on Mr. Kinahan's plan, and which he describes as a circular cloghaun, twenty-seven feet in diameter, was an unroofed enclosure, either for the temporary accommodation of guests, or for the cattle of the monastery. It was without the cashel, but within the outer wall, which seems to have run north and south, from cliff to cliff, both sheltering and defending the monastery proper as well as all its adjacent grounds and buildings. At the northern and southern extremities of this wall there were two strong buildings, marked No. 2 and 13 on the plan, which were, doubtless, employed to shelter those whose duty it was to watch and defend the approaches to the monastery.

We could find no trace of the cross which is figured by Mr. Kinahan, and which he saw near the landing-place on the eastern shore of the island. The cross at the well, which he has also sketched is now broken, and, doubtless, the fragments will also disappear in a short time.

This remote island is certainly worthy of a visit from those who take an interest in our early Christian antiquities ; but the only way in which it can be safely accomplished is

under the guidance of the brave and hardy fishermen, who dwell on the mainland at Aghros Point. The surrounding sea is full of rocks ; the cliffs are almost inaccessible ; and it would be well-nigh impossible for a stranger to find the exact place where it would be practicable to effect a landing. Doubtless this is also the reason why no family has dwelt on the island within the memory of man, although the soil seems to be fertile, and there is abundance of water, and probably as much peat as would suffice for fuel. Will the day ever come again when holy men, flying from the vanities and deceits of the world, will people once more those holy islands of the west ? Will the sound of the Angelus bell be ever heard again over these wild seas, and the chant of sacred psalmody once more awake the echoes of the ocean caves ? Who can tell ? This we know, that if we had to make the choice, we should prefer a cloghaun on this lonely but beautiful island, to a cell in some dark attic over a dirty street, where the sights and sounds and smells, by day and by night, are a perpetual abomination.

HUGH ROE O'DONNELL'S ADDRESS TO HIS SOLDIERS BEFORE THE BATTLE OF THE CURLEW MOUNTAINS.

This battle was fought on the 15th August, 1599. The Irish were commanded by Red Hugh and other chieftains; the English by Sir Conyers Clifford, Governor of Connaught. Before the battle, according to the Four Masters, O'Donnell, who had the day before fasted in honour of the Blessed Virgin, "as he was wont to do," "caused Mass to be celebrated for himself and the forces in general, and after making his confession and rigidly repenting of his sins, he received the Eucharist, and commanded his forces to pray to God fervently for the salvation of their souls in the first place, and to deliver them from the great danger which awaited them from the English." He then addressed a stirring harangue to his soldiers in the Irish language (given at length in O'Sullivan Beare), the substance of which is expressed in the following verses. O'Donnell was completely victorious; Sir Conyers Clifford, many of his officers, and nearly 1,500 of his men were killed on the field or in the flight. The Four Masters add, "That the army offered up thanks to God and the Blessed Virgin Mary for the victory, and the unanimous voice of the men was, that it was not by the force of arms the English were defeated, but by the supplication of O'Donnell and his forces, after he had received the Body and Blood of Christ in the beginning of that day after his fast the previous day in honour of the Blessed Virgin."

BROTHER chiefs, and clansmen loyal, tried in many a bloody
fray;
God be thanked these robber Saxons come to meet us here
to-day.
Boasting Clifford, Essex minion, swears he'll make the rebels
flee—
We will give him hearty greeting, like to that at Ashanee.¹
What though traitor Celts oppose us—be their number three
to one?
Greater glory to Clan Connell, when this tough day's work is
done.
Shrived at Holy Mass this morning, danger we may fearless
dare;
For we draw the sword of justice, shielded all in faith and
prayer.

¹ Ashanee—Ballyshannon, where O'Donnell routed Clifford and his forces on Lady Day, two years before.

Not for conquest, or for vengeance, on this blessed Lady
Day,

Not in strength or numbers trusting, do we face their proud
array ;

But for Holy Mary's honour, by their tainted lips defiled,
For the sacred rights of freemen, for the mother, maid, and
child.

Prone and bleeding lies our country, sorrow clouds her
crownless brow,

All the lines of peerless beauty limned in ghastly colours now.
In the light of glories olden beaming through our dark disgrace,
See the madd'ning wrongs and insults heaped upon our fallen
race !

Roofless homestead, broken altar, slaughtered priest, dis-
honoured maid—

Children of an outraged mother ! whet ye well the thirsty
blade.

Scorning rock and brushwood cover, rush like swooping eagles
forth,

Hard and home push every pike-head, sinewy spearsmen of the
North !

Cleave in twain the lustful Saxon, tame Dunkellin's soaring
pride,

Smite the double-souled O'Connors ¹—traitors false to every
side.

Down upon them, Banagh's chieftain ! sweep their ranks your
spears before,

As the North wind sweeps the stubble through the gap of old
Barnes-More.

Forward ! forward ! brave M'Dermott, strike for fair Moylurg's
domain,

For yon lake ² in beauty sleeping, for the holy island's fane.

Strike ! and drive the swinish Saxon, herding in their sacred
shade,

Far from Boyle's old abbey cloisters, where your father's bones
are laid.

¹ O'Connor Don and O'Connor Roe on this occasion, not for the first time, joined the English.

² Lough Cé, at the foot of the Curlews, in which was an island having a famous monastery dedicated to the Holy Trinity.

Holy Virgin ! we implore thee, by that abbey's ¹ rifled shrine,
 Columcille of Doire Calgach,² patron of O'Donnell's line,
 Good St. Francis ! for the glory of thy name in Donegal,
 Speed ye now Tirconnell's onset, till we rout them one and all.
 Should O'Donnell fall in combat—if the foe be forced to yield,
 Better death I never prayed for, than to fall upon the field,
 Where the cause of Erin triumphed, and the Saxon was laid low,
 With that green flag floating o'er me, and my face against the
 foe.

Never chieftain of Clan Dalaigh to th' invader bowed the knee ;
 By the black years of my bondage, it shall ne'er be done by me.
 I would rather angry ocean rolled o'er castle, cot, and hall,
 Than see any Saxon *bodach* rule in royal Donegal.
 Deathless fame in song and story will enshroud the men who
 died,

Fighting God's and freedom's battle bravely by O'Donnell's
 side.

Great will be his meed of glory, honoured long the victor's
 name,

Pointing proudly to her kinsman, many a maid will tell his
 fame ;

“ Lo ! he fought at Doonaveragh,” aged men will whispering
 say,

And make way before the altar for the heroes of to-day.

Gleaming bright through dark'ning ages will this great day's
 memory glide,

Like the Saimer's bright-wav'd waters glancing onward to the
 tide.

¹ The Cistercian Abbey of Boyle was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin.

² Doire Calgach—the oak grove of Calgach—the ancient name of Derry.

THE "STOWE MISSAL."

THE *Stowe Missal* is certainly the most valuable and interesting liturgical monument of the early Church of Ireland that has come down to our times ; and some very competent authorities have even gone so far as to say that no more important document, from a liturgical point of view, has been preserved in any of the Western Churches. From a dogmatic point of view it is hardly less interesting and less important ; so that both theologians and historians owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. MacCarthy for the admirable account of this invaluable literary treasure, which he has published in the *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, at the request of that learned body. There are few people indeed, if any, so well qualified to accomplish that task as Dr. MacCarthy ; and he has certainly spared no pains in the discharge of the duty imposed on him by the Academy.

It is to be feared, however, that a knowledge of the *Transactions of the Academy* is confined to a very limited number ; and besides, Dr. MacCarthy, from the very nature of his task, was more or less confined to the literary and antiquarian aspects of his subject. It may be interesting therefore, to the general reader, to give a more popular summary of some of the interesting questions connected with the *Stowe Missal*.

That name itself is a curious misnomer, for the only connection the manuscript had with Stowe is that it was preserved there for some time in the library of the Duke of Buckingham ; and, as Eugene O'Curry bitterly complained, its churlish and illiberal owners never allowed any Irish scholar except their own librarian to examine the *Missal*. Fortunately the MS. has since come into the possession of the Royal Irish Academy, and is now available for examination by competent scholars.

It appears from the inscriptions on the outer shrine or cover, which contains the precious MS., that the volume

was enshrined about the middle of the eleventh century. This work was executed at the joint expense of Macraith, king of Cashel, whose death is recorded by the Four Masters in A.D. 1052, and of Donchad or Donogh, the son of Brian Boru, who is described as King of Ireland at that time, but who was dethroned some ten years later for the alleged murder of his brother Tadgh.¹ The shrine was redecorated at a later period by Philip O'Kennedy, king of Ormond, and his wife Anne, both of whom died in 1381. This goes to show that the precious volume enclosed within the shrine originally belonged to some monastery in O'Kennedy's territory of Lower Ormond—most probably either to the monastery of Tir da-Glas or of Lothra, both of which were very celebrated in ancient times.

The volume itself is a small square quarto, now containing sixty-five folios, bound in oaken boards, covered with leather. Nine of the folios appear to have been inserted at a date subsequent to the original binding of the volume. The contents comprise the following tracts:—First, certain portions of the Gospel of St. John; then the *Missal* proper; next a ritual containing the Ordo Baptismi, the Visitation of the Sick, with the prayers for the administration of the Viaticum and of Extreme Unction; then there is a Tract on the Mass in Irish; and lastly, three Charms or Spells, also in Irish—showing how closely superstition follows in the track of what is best and holiest in religion. It is quite evident, therefore, that this volume served the double purpose of a missal and of a ritual for the clergy of the church in which it was preserved, and that some of them also inserted the unauthorized prayers and ceremonies which

¹ Dr. MacCarthy begins his essay by correcting an "error" of the two learned Doctors Todd and O'Connor, for which he alleges Mac Firlbis was primarily responsible. These authorities made Donogh responsible for the murder of his brother, by translating the Irish phrase, *iar na umhaill dia brathar*, "having been instigated by his brother;" whereas Dr. MacCarthy alleges that the true text is *iar n-a umal dia brathair*, which he renders, "after submission to his brother." Perhaps Dr. MacCarthy has not adverted to the fact, that in the *Chronicon Scotorum* (page 263) the words are *iar na craill do Donnachadh*, which Hennessy translates, "at the desire of Donnachadh," taking *craill* for *uail*, which he shows from the Bodleian copy to be the true reading of Tighernach, and which also seems to give the true meaning.

were supposed to be efficacious for working certain cures, and which certainly appear to savour of superstition.

Of the name of the first scribe we have no information of any kind, except what is given in an Ogham score, inserted in one of the extracts from the Gospel of St. John, which appears to give the name of the scribe, and which, if read from left to right, would be Sonid; but if from right to left, it would be Dinos. The former is probably the true reading; but of the individual thus named nothing else is known.

The inserted folios were written at a much later period than the original by a scribe, who calls himself Maelcaigh, and who is supposed to have flourished about the middle of the eighth century. Dr. MacCarthy gives a reference from *The Book of Lismore* to the genealogy of a certain Maelcaigh, who belonged to the Dalcassian race, and who seems to have been connected with the barony of Lower Ormond. It is not unlikely that this Dalcassian was the second scribe who gives his own name in the MS.

Dr. MacCarthy agrees with the late Dr. Todd, who thought that the MS. was written in a character "which might well be deemed older than the sixth century." We need not, however, assume that the MS. is older than those religious houses in Lower Ormond, to some of which it most probably belonged. Now Lorrha was founded about 550, and Terryglass, some two years earlier, so that if the *Missal* and *Ritual* belonged to either of these establishments, it was most probably written about the middle of the sixth century. The ornamentation and enshrining of the MS. show that it must have been regarded with more than the ordinary reverence due to sacred works, and we know that very often this arose from the fact that the work was either written by a sainted founder or sanctified by his use.

Both Columba of Terryglass and Ruadhan of Lorrha were Munster saints, and belonged to that second Order of the saints who received a mass from the venerable Fathers of the Welsh Church; so that if this *Missal* belonged to either of them, it most probably represents that revision of the liturgy which the Welsh saints introduced into the Irish

Church of the sixth century. This view will be further borne out by a careful examination of the few historical references to this subject that have come down to our times.

There is a very interesting document, first published by Spelman, and more recently by Haddan and Stubbs, which purports to give an account of the origin of the Roman, Gallican, and Irish liturgies. The author seems to have been an Irish monk of the monastery of Bobbio, in Italy, who flourished shortly after the death of Attala, its second abbot, in the year A.D. 627. It is true that the Irish monk only speaks of the *cursus* which corresponds with the word "office," as used in our own time; but then, as now, the rule was that the mass corresponded with the office, and hence what is said of the *cursus* may be understood of the entire liturgy, including the mass.

According to this ancient and apparently trustworthy document, the Roman *cursus*, or liturgy of St. Peter and St. Paul, was first introduced into Gaul by Trophimus, first bishop of Arles, and Photinus, first bishop of Lyons, who were themselves disciples of St. Peter, and therefore familiar with the liturgy of the Roman Church.

But Photinus was martyred, as Eusebius tells us, with forty-seven companions, and was succeeded in the see of Lyons by St. Irenæus about the year A.D. 177. Now St. Irenæus was a disciple of St. Polycarp, who being himself a disciple of St. John, naturally adopted the liturgy of that Apostle as practised in the Churches of Asia Minor. Through the influence of St. Irenæus and his successors this liturgy appears to have been very generally adopted in Gaul, and seems to have been in some respects quite different from the Roman liturgy of St. Peter and St. Paul.

But this Gallican liturgy, introduced and widely propagated by St. Irenæus, was itself subsequently displaced—at least to some extent—by the Alexandrine liturgy of St. Mark. It was brought about in this way. The celebrated John Cassian, an eastern monk, had spent many years in Egypt, in close communion with the Fathers of the desert, carefully observing their discipline, their maxims, and their manner of life. From Egypt he went for a time to

Constantinople, and finally came, about the year 415, to the neighbourhood of Marseilles, where he founded the celebrated monastery of St. Victor, into which he introduced the liturgy of the Alexandrine Church, with which he was most familiar. Amongst his pupils in the school of Lerins were St. Honoratus of Arles, St. Germanus of Auxerre, St. Lupus of Troyes, and most probably also our own St. Patrick. All these saints, who afterwards became great and influential bishops, carried away with them from Lerins not only the discipline, but also the rites and liturgy of that celebrated school.

In the year 429 the three latter saints came over to Wales in order to extirpate the Pelagian heresy, which was then infecting the British churches; for Pelagius himself was a Briton, and he had left some disciples in his native country, who were teaching his errors to the people. The name of one of them, a certain Gallicanus, is expressly mentioned by the Irish monk of Bobbio, who gives us the history of the Irish cursus.

It would seem, however, that Germanus resolved, in order to root out more thoroughly the poison of Pelagianism, to introduce the new Gallican liturgy into the British churches, and, in consequence of his eminent sanctity and great influence, he seems to have succeeded—at least to some considerable extent. Three years afterwards St. Patrick came to preach in Ireland, and, of course, we may fairly assume that the liturgy which he and his associates introduced into Ireland was that with which they themselves were most familiar, that is, the liturgy of Germanus, of Lerins, and of Alexandria.

It is stated, however, by the Irish monk of Bobbio, that this was also the liturgy of St. Jerome, of St. Gregory Nazianzen, of his brother St. Basil, of St. Anthony, St. Paul, St. Macarius, John, and other Fathers of the Egyptian deserts; and we know from independent sources that this statement is quite accurate. There is still in existence a Coptic, Greek, and Arabic liturgy bearing the name of St. Basil, which seems to have been largely used in the churches of the Alexandrine patriarchate, and the only copy of the

Greek liturgy of St. Mark that has survived up to the present was found in a monastery of the Order of St. Basil at Rossano in Calabria.¹ There is also in existence a Greek, Coptic, and Arabic liturgy used in Egypt which bears the name of St. Gregory Nazianzen; but it is practically the same as that of St. Basil. It is much more likely that St. Jerome would use the liturgy of St. James at Bethlehem and Jerusalem, where he spent the last thirty-four years of his life, than any liturgy of the Alexandrian patriarchate. We know, however, that he visited the churches of Alexandria, and the monasteries of Nitria, where in all probability he saw the Basilian liturgy in daily usage, if he did not make use of it himself.

The Irish monk then adds that this cursus was used by the aged Wandilochus and the blessed Comgall in their monastery (of Bangor), where they ruled over some three thousand monks. The same liturgy was carried to Luxeuil by Columbanus and his companions, whence it came to be widely diffused over Europe in all the Columban monasteries, as may be more fully seen in the lives of Columbanus, Eustasius, and Attala, Abbot of Bobbio.

In truth, we do find in the life of the Abbot Eustasius that one of the charges brought against him and his monks before the Burgundian bishops, was that they unduly multiplied the prayers and collects of the Mass,² which clearly points to some difference between their eucharistic liturgy and that of the Burgundian churches at this period. The same liturgy was, of course, in use at Bobbio during the lifetime of Columbanus and of his immediate disciples.

If we are to rely on this document the Patrician liturgy in use throughout all Ireland during the fifth century was adopted in the monastery of Bangor without substantial change; from Bangor it passed over to the Columban houses on the continent of Europe; and it would doubtless be represented by the liturgy of the *Bobbio Missal* and the Antiphonary of Bangor. But this liturgy was by no means

¹ See *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, page 1021.

² "Et ipse missarum solemniam multiplicatione orationum vel collectarum celebrabat." (*Vita Eustasii*; Migne, vol. lxxxvii.)

in general use throughout Ireland during the sixth and seventh centuries. Considerable diversity of usage had already grown up in Ireland about the middle of the sixth century, as we know from a very ancient authority.

According to the tract on the three Orders of Irish saints, attributed to Tirechan, the first Order had one and the same celebration of mass; but the saints of the second Order had different rites in the celebration of mass.¹ We are also told that they, or some of them, received "*ritum celebrandi Missam*"—a special rite—from the three saints of Britain—David, Gildas, and Docus, or Cadoc, as he is elsewhere called. St. Comgall, too, is expressly enumerated amongst the saints of this second Order; but the statement that they employed different rites in the celebration of mass would seem to imply that some of them, at least, did not accept the new ritual introduced from Britain; and Comgall, doubtless, was one of these. Otherwise, it would be impossible to reconcile the statement of Tirechan with that of the monk of Bobbio. It seems highly probable that the Welsh liturgy was generally adopted in the south and south-east of Ireland, to which most of these saints of the second Order belonged, but that the Patrician rite still continued to be employed in the north of Ireland, where Welsh influence was less felt. With regard to Comgall himself, I do not find that he or any of his preceptors were trained in the schools of Wales.

But how, it will be asked, did the Welsh rite, introduced into Ireland from David, Gildas, and Docus, differ from the old Patrician rite, and why was it so readily adopted by those conservative Irish saints of the second Order. This is a most interesting question to which it is very difficult to find a satisfactory answer. Was the rite of the Welsh saints the old British liturgy that existed in Wales before St. Patrick came to Ireland, and which, as we have seen, was somewhat different from that introduced by our national apostle; or was it a later Gallican or Roman rite which they learned on the continent, and sought to introduce into Ireland as more conformable to the existing discipline of the continental Churches?

¹ "*Unam celebrationem Missae*"—"diversos ritus celebrandi."

Unfortunately, we have no surviving fragment of the primitive British liturgy; it has completely disappeared.¹ St. Germanus, it would seem, tried to introduce his own Gallic liturgy; but we cannot say how far he succeeded. There is a story told in the Life of St. Brendan of Clonfert which throws some light on this question. It is said that when Brendan was in Wales with Gildas, the latter had a missal written in Greek characters, which was placed on the altar on which Brendan was invited to offer the Holy Sacrifice. Brendan then besought the Lord to make those strange characters intelligible to him; and lo! he was able to read them like Gildas himself, just as well as if they were the Latin characters with which he was familiar from his boyhood. It is not improbable that this story had its origin in the fact that the rite practised in the monastery of Gildas was quite novel to Brendan, and it may be, too, that some of the words, like *Kyrie eleison*, etc., were written in the Greek character, with which he was heretofore entirely unacquainted.

In the Life of St. David it is stated that he visited Jerusalem, that he was honourably received by the patriarch of that city, from whom he received many gifts, and thence returned home to found his own great monastery in the wild valley of Rosina, swept bare by the breezes from the Irish sea. No one acquainted with the roving habits of the Welsh and Irish monks of those days will question the reality of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, on the ground that such a journey was difficult or dangerous.

In the Life of Gildas, we are told that he visited Rome and Ravenna, and doubtless learned much of the liturgy in use in these cities. The reference to Ravenna is significant, for at that time it was the second city of the western empire, and the real seat of its government; but these facts could hardly be known to a British monk in the tenth or eleventh century who merely drew on his imagination for those foreign pilgrimages. It is a singular fact that we also find that Cadoc visited both Greece and Jerusalem before returning home to found his own great monastery of Llancarvan.

Thus we find that the three Welsh saints who were most

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, vol. i., page 138.

intimately connected with the Ireland of the sixth century, and who gave a new mass to the saints of the second Order, were men who had travelled much in Palestine, Greece, and Italy, and doubtless had seen most of the liturgies in use in the celebrated churches of those countries, and which would certainly be very different from what they had seen both in Wales and Ireland during the years of their youth—for they were all intimately connected with Ireland, and all the three seem to have spent some years in Ireland.

At least these pilgrimages to foreign lands will account for the Latin missal written in Greek characters which Brendan saw in the monastery of Gildas, and which Gildas could read, but which it was considered to be quite miraculous that the Irish saint should be able to read.

In our opinion, however, the new ritual which these saints brought from the continent, and taught to their disciples of the second Order of Irish saints was neither of Welsh nor Oriental origin, but the latest recension of the Roman liturgy, as revised by Pope Leo the Great, and afterwards by Pope Gelasius; whence it came to be called the Gelasian liturgy; and we venture to think existing monuments strongly confirm this opinion.

The revision of the Roman liturgy by St. Leo the Great (440-461) is the earliest of which we have any certain and definite information. The *Sacramentary* which bears his name is generally admitted to be genuine, and there are several phrases in it which savour strongly of the severe and vigorous style of that great Pontiff. He is said in the *Liber Pontificalis* to have added the words "*sanctum sacrificium immaculatam hostiam*" to the canon of the mass, and several collects as well as many minor alterations in the liturgy are ascribed to his authorship.¹

The *Gelasian Sacramentary*, published some fifty years later by Pope Gelasius, whose reign (492-496) was all too brief, also introduced considerable changes into the eucharistic liturgy, the most noteworthy being the revision of the canon, which on that account still bears this Pontiff's name in many of the ancient missals.

¹ See Migne, vol. lv., page 320.

It is obvious that these important changes could not easily have come to the knowledge of St. Patrick in our remote, and, from a Roman point of view, semi-barbarous island. It is almost certain that he died about the very time in which Gelasius became supreme Pontiff. So that neither the liturgy of St. Patrick nor of his contemporaries could be in conformity with the latest Roman emendations, during any part of the fifth century, nor probably during the first fifty years of the following century. But Welsh or Irish pilgrims going to Rome in the course of the sixth century would, doubtless, note these changes, and be anxious to bring their own liturgy at home more into conformity with the Roman usage. We have no doubt this is the true cause of the readiness with which the Irish saints of the second Order accepted a Mass from the Welsh monastic Fathers, whose disciples they were. On the other hand, in those parts of the country where there was less foreign intercourse, or where they were more tenacious of their native customs, the old Patrician liturgy would still hold its ground; and this, doubtless, serves to explain the different rites used in celebrating Mass, which prevailed in Ireland under this second Order of saints.

A comparison of the *Stowe* and the *Bobbio Missal* will help to throw further light on this very interesting question. The *Stowe Missal*, as it appears at present, is, as we have seen, written in two different hands. The greater portion is written in a hand which competent authorities declare may well go back to the first half of the sixth, or even to the fifth century. If so, it may represent in those parts a liturgy older than the Gelasian recension, which could not have come into general use in Ireland before the middle of the sixth century; for the second Order of saints who introduced this new mass into their monastic churches flourished from A.D. 554 to 596; that is, during the latter half of the sixth century. This is strongly confirmed by the fact that the old canon of the *Missal* has been erased, and the Gelasian canon written in by the second hand, who flourished at a much later period. It also shows that these more recent changes in the *Missal* were made to bring it into conformity not with any oriental or Gallican rite, but with the later

emendations of the Roman liturgy. The same conclusion is still further established by the fact that the *Bobbio Missal*, which was written during the last half of the seventh century, has, for what we now call the Ordinary of the Mass, the *Missa Romensis Cottidiana*, or daily Roman Mass; thus clearly showing that the disciples of Columbanus, whilst in many things adhering to the old Patrician cursus of Bangor, were quite ready to accept any revision of the liturgy that came clearly before them with the sanction of the Apostolic See.

Another important point to be noted is the prominence that is given in both these missals to the prayers for the Pope. In the *Stowe Missal* this prayer is given for the ordinary or daily mass in the following form:—

"Deus, qui Beato Petro, apostolo tuo, conlatis clavibus regni caelestis, animas ligandi atque solvendi pontificium tradidisti suscipe propitius preces nostras et intercessione ejus quaesumus, Domine, auxilium, ut a peccatorum nostrorum nexibus liberemur. Per Dominum, etc."

This prayer is written in the first or original hand in the *Stowe Missal*, and it is a curious fact that it is given in the same place and in the very same words in the *Bobbio Missal*, as printed by Muratori.¹

A careful examination and comparison of these two missals of our early Irish Church will also throw much light on many other questions that are highly interesting, both from a theological and antiquarian point of view. For the present, however, we must content ourselves in pointing out in a general way, from the evidence of these MSS., the intimate connection that existed between the Irish and the Roman Church during that very period during which certain writers would have us believe that the Irish Church lived in a state of isolated independence of the Apostolic See. Such theories can no longer be maintained with any show of probability, for the purely negative arguments by which it was sought to support them are found in the light of facts to be dissipated into thin air.

¹ See Father Lavery's *Down and Connor*, vol. ii, App. 3.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN IRELAND.¹

THE question of University Education in Ireland has come once more to the front. Since Mr. Balfour's celebrated declaration in the House of Commons towards the close of last Session, public men of every party have touched upon the question, and the tone of their observations is very significant. Mr. Balfour said that, in his opinion, something ought to be done to give a higher University education to Roman Catholics in Ireland; that it was perfectly clear that nothing which had been hitherto done would really meet the wants and wishes of the Roman Catholic population in Ireland; and that there was nothing but to try and devise some scheme by which the wants of the Roman Catholic population should be met other than those which, up to the present, had been attempted. He was not on that occasion ready to suggest even the outlines of what the scheme should be, but that "they ought, if possible, carry out such a scheme as would satisfy all the legitimate aspirations of the Roman Catholics he entertained no doubt."

Nearly all the newspapers and a good many of the politicians at once rushed to the conclusion that Mr. Balfour, in these words, had formally promised to charter and endow a Roman Catholic University in Ireland during the coming year—a project, whether real or imaginary, which was at once denounced from various quarters and from very different motives. It was a deep-laid scheme to sow dissension between English and Irish Radicals; it was an attempt to draw a red-herring across the Home Rule scent, and thereby divert keen-nosed politicians from the pursuit of that *summum bonum*; it was a Greek gift to seduce the Irish hierarchy from their allegiance to the national cause; it was the price to be paid for the Papal condemnation of boycotting and the plan of campaign; it was a concession to certain reactionary Irish Bishops; it was, in a word, a mockery, a delusion, and a snare. A few ultra-

¹ This paper appeared in the *Dublin Review*, January, 1890.

Orangemen in Belfast, Liverpool, and Glasgow also raised their tiny voices in protest against Mr. Balfour's project ; but what is much more surprising, this supposed project was denounced by leading Catholic members of the Home Rule party, because it was a Denominational scheme of education. Mr. T. P. O'Connor said at Peterborough that, for his part, " he should be sorry to see the college of any sect endowed by the Government, and that the Nationalists of Ireland, like himself, did not think any man to be the better or worse for his religion."¹ Mr. Michael Davitt likewise, in his letter to the *Freeman's Journal*, expressed himself as opposed to Denominational education as it is usually understood. He had a better scheme of his own, which he has not yet propounded, but which will doubtless appear in due course. Mr. Justin McCarthy, however, does not go so far as this, but in the *Contemporary Review* for September he wishes to press another question on the attention of the English public ; and it is this—" Whether the whole settlement of the question about Irish University Education had not better be left to an Irish National Parliament." It is not to be wondered at that many of the Irish Catholics, taking note of the views held by prominent Irish Nationalists, like Messrs. Davitt and O'Connor, answer Mr. McCarthy's question in the negative, and think it by all means far safer to settle the question now, if, as Mr. Balfour says, it is at all possible.

We think it a very great misfortune that Irish Catholics should allow their views on the Education Question to be warped by political considerations of any kind. It is essentially a religious question ; it is above and beyond politics ; it ought to be discussed and decided on its own merits, that is, from the standpoint of justice and conscience alone. It is a matter that cannot be sold or bargained for, and that ought not be deferred or sub-ordinated to any temporal question whatsoever. A sound Catholic education is, in the estimation of all true Catholics, a precious pearl beyond price, because it is intimately connected with the salvation of immortal souls. We propose to discuss this question, therefore, on its own intrinsic merits, leaving aside all purely political considerations.

¹ *Daily News*, October 5.

Let others discuss it, if they will, on the ground of expediency ; we shall discuss it merely on the ground of what is just and right.

Mr. Balfour admits that in this matter of university education Irish Roman Catholics have a want and a grievance. Mr. Gladstone has himself admitted the same in still more emphatic language. Years ago he said the state of things was scandalously bad, and last autumn he declared, when criticizing Mr. Balfour's observations, that in his opinion in this matter the Roman Catholics have not yet got justice in Ireland ; that, like the Minister, he desires with all his heart to provide for the higher education of the Roman Catholic population, and that Mr. Balfour's declaration that a grievance exists, which ought to be remedied, " is a truism to which the whole population of the country, Catholic and Protestant, must alike assent." As Lord Hartington put it :

" We have the authority of Mr. Gladstone, as well as of Mr. Balfour, that this question of University Education in Ireland has not yet been solved, and that it is not yet insoluble. By the authority of both it is the duty of some one to make another attempt to solve this question, and it does not lie in the mouth of one who, like myself, was a member of Mr. Gladstone's Government in 1873, which attempted to settle this question, to declare now that it is a question insoluble by the British Parliament, and which can only be solved by giving power to an Irish Home Rule Parliament to do that which at the same time, we declare to be wrong and monstrous of an English Parliament to do."¹

It must be borne in mind, too, that Mr. Parnell, at the urgent request of the Irish hierarchy, pressed upon the Government to take up this question, and do justice by removing the admitted grievances of Irish Roman Catholics, especially in this matter of university education. When the leaders of all the political parties in the House of Commons admit the grievance, and the duty of promptly redressing it, the Government can, we should think, very well afford to despise the protests of a few ultra-Orangemen on the one hand, and of a few extreme and anti-Catholic Radicals on the other.

Mr. Balfour has more recently taken the public into his confidence, and given us an outline of his intentions in this matter of doing educational justice to the Roman Catholics of Ireland. He tells us what would be just and right to do, -

¹ Speech at Aberdeen, October 2nd, 1889. See *The Times*, October 31d, 1889.

if he could get everybody to help him in doing it, and if the Irish would cordially accept the generous boon which he has in store for them. If Mr. Balfour were Minister in a Utopian Republic, he might perhaps talk in this fashion, but he ought to know that no Irish Question ever was, or probably ever will be, settled in this pleasant way. He announces clearly enough that he will not give us a Catholic University in Ireland with the power of granting degrees and all the other privileges of a university. Neither will he endow any theological chairs with public money, nor any religious sect as such. Even if he were disposed to make any proposals of this kind, it is quite evident that he could never carry them through the Imperial Parliament—it would be simply to rush on to destruction.

Even the imaginary proposal supposed to have been made by Mr. Balfour of chartering and endowing a Catholic University seems to have awakened very considerable alarm and opposition in various quarters, and the Minister has found it necessary to declare that he never contemplated anything of the kind. Yet such a solution of the question would undoubtedly be most in accordance with the abstract justice of the case. For if Trinity College, an institution Protestant in its flavour and complexion and practical working, as Mr. Balfour admits, has not only all the privileges of a university, but enormous revenues for the benefit of a small section, and that the richer section, of the population, why in the name of justice and common sense should not the Catholic majority be entitled to at least equal rights and privileges in this matter of higher education?

We shall not discuss this question, however, on the principles of abstract justice. We admit the difficulties by which it is surrounded, and we shall consider what is practicable and reasonable even from an English and Scotch point of view, rather than from an Irish point of view. And yet the fact that it is to a Scotch audience that Mr. Balfour unbosoms himself on this question, and that it is *their* assent he asks for, not ours, is a very significant one. We shall take the liberty of putting forward some other considerations that must be taken into account in the settlement of this matter,

and we are at least as well entitled to discuss it as any of Mr. Balfour's numerous correspondents.

The past history of this question will serve to throw much light on the problem now awaiting solution. The blunders and failures of the past in dealing with this question have been frankly admitted; yet too often statesmen, misled by the same false principles, fall into similar errors. This was signally the case with Mr. Gladstone in 1873. He undertook to remedy the grievances of Catholics, which notoriously arose from the mixed system, that had been forced upon them, and yet his proposal was simply a measure to extend and consolidate that very mixed system the *fons et origo* of all the mischief. The fundamental mistake which English statesmen have made in this, as in many other questions, is the assumption that they know better what suits Ireland than Irishmen themselves do. This has been shown in every successive attempt to deal with the Education Question, and especially with Higher or University Education.

On the 31st of July, 1845, the royal assent was given to "An Act to enable Her Majesty to Endow New Colleges for the Advancement of Learning in Ireland." We may acquit the authors of this Bill of any purpose hostile to the Catholic religion; we may even credit them with the sincere purpose of legislating solely for the advancement of learning in Ireland. This is admitted in the Synodical Address of the great Synod of Thurles, which was issued the year after these colleges first came into operation.

"The system may have been devised"—say the Fathers—"in a spirit of generous and impartial policy; but the statesmen who framed it were not acquainted with the inflexible nature of our doctrines, and with the jealousy with which we are obliged to avoid everything opposed to the purity and integrity of our Catholic faith. Hence these institutions, which would have called forth our profound and lasting gratitude, had they been framed in accordance with our religious tenets and principles, must now be considered as an evil of a formidable kind, against which it is our imperative duty to warn you with all the energy of our zeal and all the weight of our authority."

These are important words, which any English statesman undertaking to legislate for Ireland would do well to remember, for they point out the true cause of much subsequent agitation and mischief. The Queen's Colleges had been already

condemned by the Holy See before they came into operation, on two occasions, in 1874, and again in 1848; that condemnation was now solemnly promulgated by the entire hierarchy of Catholic Ireland; yet the English Government made no real attempt to modify their constitution, or bring them into harmony with the wants and wishes of the Catholic people of Ireland. Once more in their ignorance of Ireland they miscalculated. They were hoping that by the money prizes, and by the great educational advantages which were offered in the new colleges to a people who always loved learning, they might be tempted to disobey their pastors, and perhaps be gradually weaned away from that affectionate allegiance to their priesthood, which English statesmen have never liked. With this view, £1,500 per annum was set apart in each of the colleges for exhibitions and other money prizes, so that there were almost as many exhibitions and scholarships as students in Galway and Cork—exhibitions mostly at that time of sufficient value to support, and clothe, and lodge, and procure books for the poor students, whose parents and families were just emerging from the black shadow of a desolating famine—yet the bait was spurned by those very middle classes for whom the colleges were especially instituted. During the twenty-two years that elapsed, from 1849 to 1871, the statistics of which I have now before me, the average number of Catholics who matriculated in Belfast was three, in Cork, twenty-seven, in Galway forty-three—a number not half that which would have entered one of these colleges if they were so modified in constitution as to admit within their walls those conscientious Catholics who thought an exhibition too dear to be purchased with peril of their faith. Yet these colleges were maintained during all these years, and are still maintained, at enormous expense to the public purse, whilst the Catholic youth of the middle classes frequent the unendowed Catholic colleges that are to be found in every county in Ireland, and several of which, like Clongowes and Blackrock, have more students in Arts than Cork and Galway put together.

In 1866 the first attempt was made to provide a remedy for this state of things, which was at once a grievance and a scandal

—a grievance to Catholics, and a scandal in a nation professing the civil and religious equality of all its subjects before the law. In the previous November, several leading statesmen, including Mr. Gladstone, had an interview with the four Catholic archbishops of Ireland. The archbishops communicated the substance of the interview to their brother prelates in Ireland, and the result was that, on the 14th of January, 1866, a meeting of the bishops was held in Dublin, at which a statement was adopted and forwarded to Sir George Grey, the Home Secretary. In this document the bishops ask her Majesty's Government to grant them "not all that we have a claim to, but to introduce modifications in the existing system of Academical education which will enable Catholic students to obtain university degrees without the sacrifice of principle or conscience of which we complain. We shall be thankful for such changes if they do not interfere with Catholic teaching, and if they tend to put us on a footing of equality with our fellow-subjects of other religious denominations" This was certainly a modest and reasonable demand—liberty of conscience and liberty of teaching, with the right to obtain university degrees, and, of course, some endowment, which might tend in this respect also to put Catholics on a footing of equality with their fellow-subjects of other religious denominations. Then the prelates point out how this may be effected in detail :

1st. That the University founded by the Roman Catholic bishops (in Dublin) will be chartered as a College within the new University (which the Government proposed to establish) in such a manner as to leave the department of teaching Catholics altogether in the hands of Catholics, and under the control of the bishops, its founders.

2ndly. That in order to place this new Catholic College on a footing of equality with other institutions, a suitable endowment be given to it ; since it will be frequented by the great mass of Catholics, as it would be manifestly unfair to oblige them to tax themselves for the support of their own College, while institutions, which they, on conscientious grounds, condemn and shun, are supported out of the public funds, to which they contribute equally with others.

3rdly. That, for the same reason, burses and scholarships be provided either by the application of existing, or the creation of new endowments, so as to place the reward of merit equally within the reach of all.

4thly. That the Catholic University College be empowered to affiliate colleges and schools to itself.

5thly. That the tests of knowledge be applied in such a manner as to avoid the appearance of connecting, even by the identity of name, those who avail themselves of them, or co-operate in applying them with a system which their religion condemns.

6thly. That the tests of knowledge guard against every danger of abuse, or of the exercise of any influence hostile or prejudicial to the religious principles of Catholics ; that they may be made as general as may be, consistently with a due regard for the interests of education, the time, the manner, and matter of examinations being prescribed, but not the books or special authors, at least in mental and social science, in history, or in cognate subjects ; and that, in a word, there be banished from them even the suspicion of interference with the religious principles of Catholics.

7thly. That the Queen's Colleges be re-arranged on the principles of the denominational system of education.

We have quoted the salient points of this document at full length ; because it is an authoritative exposition of the views of the bishops, and enters more into detail than any other document emanating from the same source that has come to our knowledge. As such it is worthy of careful perusal by everyone who will have any influence in the settlement of this great question. The general principle laid down is perfectly clear. First, the prelates want a system by which Catholic students can obtain University degrees without sacrifice of principle or conscience ; secondly, they want their students in the effort to obtain these degrees, to be placed on a footing of equality with their fellow-subjects of other religious persuasions. No right-minded man can object to these two demands—to refuse either of them is simply to re-impose civil disabilities on account of religion. The bishops then suggest a way of carrying out these two principles in practice. The answer of Sir George Grey is even more significant than the petition of the prelates, because it exhibits those points of disagreement between the Catholic demand and the Liberal programme, which it is essential to bear in mind in any future settlement of the question.

Sir George first re-iterates what was long ago admitted, that the founders of the Queen's Colleges meant well ; and he adds that her Majesty's Government are still of opinion that the principle on which they were founded is a sound one—a somewhat superfluous if not impertinent observation in the circumstances of the case. But it has this important consequence—that her Majesty's Government declare that they have no intention of proposing any alteration in the principle on which these colleges are conducted—in other words, in the mixed system of university education. This

was a point-blank refusal to No. 7 of the episcopal demands—namely, that the Queen's Colleges should be modified or rearranged on the Denominational system of education. It is, however, mainly a question of squandering public money. If Catholics are placed on that footing of equality to which they are entitled, it is really a very secondary matter how money is spent on the empty halls of Cork and Galway. But it shows how the Liberal Government thought they understood the wants and wishes of Catholic Ireland at the time so much better than Catholic Irishmen themselves. The Government, however, admits that a large number of Irishmen entertain conscientious objections both to the Queen's Colleges and to Trinity College, and consequently have no means of obtaining a degree in Ireland if they aspire to a liberal profession. This they admit is a grievance, and with a view of providing a remedy Sir George Grey simply proposes to assimilate the Queen's University to the London University, and thereby enable it to confer degrees on all comers who pass the examination. This was not much of a boon, for the London University gave its degrees even to Irishmen in exactly the same way; and even at a later date sent over its examiners to certain centres in Ireland, where a considerable number of students was to be found. The Government were, however, willing to grant a "Charter of Incorporation" to the institution founded in Dublin by the Roman Catholic archbishops, but not in the form of the Draft Charter which the prelates had sent over with their memorial. They would grant an endowment, at least beyond the expenses for examinations; and they would not give power to affiliate other colleges or schools to the Central college. This was, as they alleged, the exclusive prerogative of a university. As to the two paragraphs about the tests of knowledge and their application, they did not, they said, clearly understand their drift, but the Senate of the new university would be constituted in such a way as to entitle it to the confidence of the various religious bodies, and all the details of the examinations had better be left to this Senate.

The bishops in reply to Sir George Grey, very naturally asserted that there was no effective step taken in this scheme

to place Catholics on a footing of equality with their non-Catholic fellow-subjects, but they reserved their definite reply until they should have an opportunity of seeing the two new Charters—that is, of the new University and of the Catholic College. The latter never appeared, and the former which is known to history as the Supplemental Charter, was an abortion, and only survived a brief period. It was issued in June, 1866, and authorized persons other than students of Queen's Colleges to be admitted to examinations, honours, and degrees ; but it appears that it was an illegal document, and the Master of the Rolls, on the application of three graduates of the Queen's University, granted an injunction forbidding the Senate to make any further use of that precious document, and so the Supplemental Charter disappeared from Irish University life ; and, we believe, no one regretted its premature extinction.

It will be seen from the history of these transactions what ideas the *doctrinaries* of the Liberal Government in 1866 had about placing Catholics on a footing of educational equality with their fellow-subjects ; and how much better they knew what was good for us in Ireland than we possibly could know ourselves !

Even the poor boon of allowing certain Catholic colleges to be affiliated to the Incorporated College in Dublin they curtly refused on grounds that, as a matter of fact, are not true, and even if true would furnish no adequate reason for their refusal. Liberty and equality—certainly we will give you both and degrees too ! but of money—and all that money can procure, buildings, professors, books, museums, exhibitions and rewards—absolutely none. These are not for conscientious Papists ; if you won't come to our colleges in spite of your bishops and your consciences, you must do without those things—such aids to learning are not for you. And an enlightened press applauded loudly, and proclaimed, at the corners of all the streets, how fairly and how justly English statesmen governed Ireland !

Mr. Fawcett's Act was the next move. The Catholic claim was indefeasible. The Liberals felt it ; and although they were not prepared to do anything in reality, nevertheless, they

wished to appear to do something. They would answer just as well, and what is more, save their consistency. Trinity College was a Protestant institution, as it is to this day, and will be for many generations to come. It had 200,000 acres of the soil of Ireland; splendid buildings erected at the public expense; a large number of rich livings in its gift to reward its faithful servitors, but all secured to members of the Established Church; whilst the poor Papists in Stephen's Green would not get from the public funds what would glaze a broken pane of glass. It was clear that this state of things could never last; so the Liberals took heart of grace, and resolved to throw open, *on paper*, everything in Trinity to Roman Catholics, as well as to Protestants; knowing well that Trinity would continue to be quite as great a stronghold of Protestantism after the Act as it was before it, and perhaps a trifle more so. We do not say that Mr. Fawcett knew all this, but the Trinity men knew it well. Outwardly, they gave a reluctant consent; but they were glad in their hearts, for was it not in their own hands to hold what they had got, whilst the passing of the Bill would save them from the Philistines? Conscientious Churchmen, however, were strongly opposed to Mr. Fawcett's Bill. They declared that Trinity College was founded by a great Protestant Queen, that it was endowed with Protestant funds, that it was the mainstay of the Protestant Church in Ireland, and they strongly objected to its secularization, as they justly called it. The Roman Catholics, too, loudly declared that opening Trinity College would not satisfy them; they did not ask it; and they would not have it. The project would only add one more to the existing Queen's Colleges. These views were tersely summed up by an observation of the present Lord Emly, then Mr. Monsell, in the House of Commons. "The scheme!" he said, "would deprive Trinity College of the confidence of the Protestants, and would not gain for it the confidence of the Catholics."

In July, 1867, Mr. Fawcett's motion for throwing open Trinity College was lost only by the casting vote of the Speaker. The Conservative Government, then in power, saw clearly that they must at once either do justice to the Catholics by

conceding their demands, or adopt Mr. Fawcett's Bill to save themselves and Trinity College from an adverse vote of the House of Commons.

The Earl of Mayo now appeared upon the scene, and announced the Government proposals in the House of Commons on the 10th of March, 1868, and a few days afterwards sent a memorandum to the Archbishop of Cashel, in which he proposes for the first time to create a Catholic University, "which, as far as circumstances would permit, should stand in the same position to Roman Catholics as Trinity College does to Protestants; that is to say, that the governing body should consist of, and the teaching should be conducted mainly by, Roman Catholics, but that full security should be taken that no religious influence should be brought to bear on students who belonged to another faith." This was hopeful so far; but in carrying out these general principles Lord Mayo made some fatal mistakes.

The proposal now made is as follows :—

That a Charter for a Roman Catholic University should be granted to the following persons to be named in the Charter :—A chancellor, a vice-chancellor, four prelates, the President of Maynooth, six laymen, the heads of the colleges proposed to be affiliated, and five members to be elected, one by each of the five faculties in the affiliated college or colleges.

The future Senate should be formed as follows :—A chancellor, to be elected by Convocation; a vice-chancellor, to be appointed by the chancellor; four prelates, to be nominated by the Roman Catholic hierarchy; the President of Maynooth; six laymen, to be elected by Convocation; the heads of the affiliated colleges; five members, to be elected by the faculties, as before mentioned. The Senate would be twenty in number, all being members of the Roman Catholic Church. Convocation to consist of the chancellor, senate, professors, and graduates.

Until the colleges are firmly established, it may be proper to postpone the question of endowment. It is one of great difficulty, and need not form an indispensable portion of the plan.

It may, however, be necessary to ask Parliament to provide a sufficient sum for the payment of the expenses of the examinations, for the foundation of a certain number of university Scholarships, and the giving away of prizes, and also the payment of the salaries of certain officers and servants of the university, and perhaps some provision for a university hall and examination rooms.

Dr. Leahy of Cashel, and Dr. Derry of Clonfert, were deputed to confer with the Ministers on this project, and in their observations, which they committed to writing, they raise

two main objections, and offer two suggestions, that deserve to be carefully noted. They object to the Senate having a veto on the appointment of the heads and professors of the affiliated colleges, but that was a point which very likely the Government would not press ; and, secondly, they object to the Chancellor and the six lay members of the Senate being chosen by Convocation, and not by the Senate itself. It does not appear to be a matter of vital importance, at least so far as the election of the six laymen is concerned.

The suggestions made are of much greater importance. It was suggested :

First—That the chancellor should be always a bishop, and that the first chancellor should be Cardinal Cullen.

Secondly—That as faith and morality may be injuriously affected either by the heterodox teaching of professors, lecturers, and other officers, or by their bad moral example, or by the introduction of bad books into the University programme, the very least power that could be claimed for the bishops on the Senate, with a view to the counteraction of such evils, would be that of an absolute negative on such books, and on the first nomination of professors, etc., etc., as well as on their continuing to hold their offices after having been judged by the bishops on the Senate to have grievously offended against faith or morals.

Here is the rock on which the whole project was wrecked. Except the power indicated in this paragraph were *in some way* secured to the bishops it could not be called a Catholic university at all, and the bishops could not, without foregoing a right essentially inherent in their office, take any part in its government as a Catholic institution. Any other point they might concede—but this point they could not concede without at the same time foregoing the exercise of a divine right which belongs to them, and to them alone, as pastors of their flocks. The two prelates put it as clearly and curtly as possible. “According to the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church it is not competent for laymen, not even for clergymen of the second order, however learned, to judge authoritatively of faith and morality. That is the exclusive province of the bishops. Yet the Government replied to this clear *non possumus* of the bishops with an equally emphatic *non volumus* :—

“The propositions that the episcopal members of the Senate should possess any power greater than their lay colleagues is

one that her Majesty's Government cannot entertain." And so Lord Mayo's famous proposal to create a Catholic University came to grief.

Later on, Mr. Fawcett took advantage of Lord Mayo's failure to pass his own Bill for throwing open the offices, honours and emoluments of Trinity College, to all persons without religious distinction ; but, as was so clearly anticipated, the Catholic grievance was not thereby removed. At a meeting of the Irish bishops, held in Maynooth, on the 18th of August, 1869, it was unanimously resolved in the case of the establishment of one National University in this kingdom for examining candidates and conferring degrees, that the Catholic people of Ireland are entitled in justice to demand that in such a University or annexed to it—

(a) They shall have a distinct college conducted upon purely Catholic principles, and at the same time fully participating in the privileges enjoyed by other colleges of whatsoever denomination or character.

(b) That the University honours and emoluments be accessible to Catholics equally with their Protestant fellow-subjects.

(c) That the examinations and other details of University arrangement be free from every influence hostile to the religious sentiments of Catholics, and that with this view the Catholic element be adequately represented upon the Senate or other Supreme University body by persons enjoying the confidence of the Catholic bishops, priests and people of Ireland.

The bishops furthermore declare that "a settlement of the University Question to be complete, and at the same time in accordance with the wishes of the Catholic people of Ireland, must include the re-arrangement of the Queen's Colleges on the Denominational principle."

Since the failure of Lord Mayo's attempt to create a Catholic university it was felt that the prospects of obtaining a distinct university for Irish Catholics were now considerably diminished. But the Liberals were again in power, and hopes were held out of creating one great National University, in which full justice would be done to Catholics both as to degrees and endowments. Mr. Gladstone, too, had just succeeded in disestablishing the Protestant Church ; and it was hoped that he would also disestablish Trinity College, and either level up or down in the matter of endowment by dividing its revenues with the Catholic College, or endowing the

latter on an equally liberal scale. It is hardly necessary for us to explain at any length how these sanguine hopes were doomed to disappointment. The Minister persisting in his own views with wilful blindness succeeded in producing a scheme which, though ushered in with a great flourish of trumpets, pleased nobody and wrecked his own Government. To fall in an honest effort to do justice, where it had been long denied, would be to fall with honour ; but Mr. Gladstone's project and Ministry both fell amidst a universal shout of disapproval. His persistence in that unhappy scheme in the face of the repeated declarations of the Irish Catholic bishops and priests and people seems to have been nothing short of infatuation. It was confidently hoped that he would charter and endow a Catholic college in the great National University, which he proposed to found, and which could secure the double advantage of the highest standard of education with the widest range of competition, and yet leave freedom and autonomy to the Catholic institution to enable it to follow its own principles. The language in which the Prime Minister at first announced his project was eminently calculated to foster this hope. He admitted that, as regards Catholics, the provision for university education was " miserably " and " scandalously " bad ; he proposed to redress this grievance ; yet, as the Irish prelates solemnly declared whilst the Bill was yet before the House, " he brought forward a measure singularly inconsistent with his professions, because, instead of redressing, it perpetuates that grievance, upholding two out of three of the Queen's Colleges, and planting in the metropolis two other great teaching institutions, the same in principle with the Queen's Colleges." And in the matter of endowments, the Catholics as such got nothing at all. Trinity college was left its £50,000 a year, with all its splendid buildings, and libraries, and museums ; the new university was to get £50,000 more for its own purposes ; Belfast and Cork were each to have about £10,000 a year, but for the Catholic college in Stephen's Green, not a shilling. The bishops declared that they would not affiliate their college to this new university, " unless the proposed scheme be largely modified " ; and they had the same objection to the affiliation of any other

Catholic colleges in Ireland. This declaration sealed the fate of the Bill. Attacked by the Secularists on one flank, by the Catholic prelates on the other, and by the Conservative Opposition in the front—even though Mr. Cardwell declared that nothing in the Bill was essential—it was found impossible to modify it so as to please the assailants. It came down, and brought the Government with it. The division was taken for the second reading on the 11th of March, 1873, and the Ministry resigned on the 13th of March.

The debate on the second reading is full of interest and instruction. The champions of the contending interests put forth all their strength. It was a war of giants, for which the rival orators had long been preparing, for this Irish University measure had been set forth in the Queen's Speech as the principal measure of the Session. Major O'Reilly's speech was remarkable for the frankness and fulness of detail with which he spoke on behalf of the Irish Catholics, as well as the vigour with which he attacked the Queen's Colleges. He declared that he would not send his sons to any college which did not teach his own religion. He could not expose them to the risk of having their cherished faith assailed in lectures on history and philosophy. He would have them taught in a thoroughly Catholic atmosphere, and by a Catholic professor; whereas Trinity College and the Queen's Colleges were institutions essentially Protestant. All the same, as a citizen and a tax-payer, he demanded educational equality for the institution in which he and Catholics like him meant to educate their sons—that is, State recognition, and a proportionate share of the honours and emoluments granted by the State in aid of university education. About the same time, Mr. John George McCarthy, the present Land Commissioner, in a letter to the *Spectator*, pertinently asked and answered the question:—"Why don't I send my sons to 'mixed' colleges? For the same reason that my fathers did not send their sons to the Protestant Churches, because of conscientious objections. Our fathers endured disabilities for their religious opinions in one case; our sons will endure disabilities for their religious opinions in the other case. But the first infliction is now called persecution; the second

is called equality." It would be impossible to put the Catholic case in briefer and more cogent form.

On the other hand, all the friends of a liberal education were indignant at the Ministerial proposal to exclude philosophy and modern history from the curriculum of university studies. This was designed as a sop to propitiate the Catholics, but the Catholics repudiated the illiberal boon. It was bad enough to have a mixed university, but a university without philosophy and history was a misnomer—it was neither fish, flesh, nor good red herring; it was attacked from all quarters, stoned to death by all the people, and no attempt has been even made to resuscitate it. The Royal University in this respect occupies a much more honourable position. Philosophy and modern history hold a high place in its programme, as well the proofs for the immortality of the soul, the existence of God, and the other great truths of Natural Religion.

For the next seven years nothing further was done or attempted. The Liberals had tried their hands twice and failed; the Conservatives had tried in 1868 and failed also, a failure which, for our own part, we always regretted, because with a little compromise on both sides we think the measure might have been made a good one, and more in accordance with Catholic principles than anything we have since got. Notwithstanding this first failure they resolved, after a considerable interval, to make another effort to remedy the Catholic grievance, and this time they were partially successful at least to the extent of producing the Royal University.

This latest "Act to promote the Advancement of Learning, and to extend the benefits connected with University Education in Ireland" received the Royal Assent on the 15th of August, 1879. By this Act and the Royal Charter issued under its provisions, the Queen's University was dissolved and the new Royal University constituted, which, whatever be its shortcomings, has certainly surpassed in its general success and popularity the most sanguine expectations of its founders. That success is due, in the first place, to the fact that the University grants its degrees to all matriculated students, no matter where or by whom educated, if they "satisfy the Senate that they are qualified on point of

learning to obtain the same ;" and we are told on official authority that no less than 3,130 persons presented themselves at the various Academical Examinations for the year 1888. Secondly, the Senate is enabled to offer from its Parliamentary grant, which is yearly to be expended in exhibitions, scholarships, studentships, and other prizes, a very considerable sum of money, as rewards for high proficiency in the various subjects of examination. At the same time, with a view to secure, as far as possible, these prizes for the students of unendowed colleges and schools, it has been most wisely provided by Act of Parliament that no student holding any exhibition or other valuable prize in any university or college endowed with public money shall hold any of the exhibitions or other prizes of the Royal University without taking the value of such previous exhibition or prize into account and deducting the same from the value of the Royal University prize or exhibition. By this means the prize money is to some extent secured for the successful students, who are trained in the unendowed colleges, or by private tutors.

The statutes also empower the Senate to elect twenty-nine Fellows, with a salary of £400 a year each ; but if the Fellow be a Fellow or Professor of any other college or university endowed with public money, his salary in such other institution must be deducted from £400, and he can only receive the difference from the Royal University. By this provision, although half the Fellowships are assigned to the Queen's Colleges, the amount of money which they receive from the Royal University does not average more than about £80 a year for each Fellowship. On the other hand, the twelve Fellows at present assigned to University College, Stephen's Green, and the Single Fellow assigned to Magee College, Derry, receive each £400 a year, which to that extent provides an indirect endowment for the professors of these two colleges.

This system, however, of indirect endowment has two serious drawbacks. In the first place it is altogether inadequate to place these colleges on a footing of equality with the Queen's Colleges, and in the second place, it seriously

interferes with the due performance of the primary function of the Royal University as an Examining University. These are two points which we must be allowed to develop at some length, and for this reason, until these two defects are remedied, neither the Catholic students, nor the general body of the students coming for their degrees to the Royal University, can or ought to be satisfied, because, as a matter of fact, they can have neither equality nor perfect fair play. The prizes and degrees of the Royal University are, with the restrictions already explained, open to all comers—to the private student, to the students of the unendowed colleges, and also to the students of the Queen's Colleges, and of Trinity College, from which last they come in very considerable numbers, when there is anything likely to be gained thereby; and they have the additional advantage of being on the spot even for the honour and degree examinations. Now, in Trinity College they have enormous revenues, splendid buildings, a highly-trained and highly-paid and most efficient staff of professors; they have all the appliances of study, which every year are becoming more elaborate and more expensive. They have similar aids to learning provided at the public expense in the Queen's Colleges—professors, buildings, books, and apparatus of every kind. Some £10,500 a year, in fact, is spent in procuring for each of these colleges all these elaborate and indispensable aids, both animate and inanimate, to the acquisition of knowledge.

Surely the heads or defenders of these institutions will not say that the money spent in procuring this splendid educational machinery is not well spent. Be it so, then. But can the students who have none of these things provided for them from the public purse, who must, in fact, go against their consciences or do without them either wholly or in part—can these students, when they come up to the Royal University to be examined with their rivals from Trinity College and the Queen's Colleges, be regarded as fairly matched in this race for honour and reward? Surely no one will venture to assert it.

Then, again, in many cases the Queen's College students can gain a double set of prizes—first in the Royal University,

and afterwards in the Queen's College. "A student who has obtained an exhibition in the Royal University is eligible for a scholarship or an exhibition in the Queen's Colleges,"¹ and no deduction will in that case be made, or, indeed, can be made, if the student gains his exhibition *first* in the Royal University, and *then* goes down to one of the Queen's Colleges and stands his examination for another exhibition or scholarship. Students, therefore, coming from the unendowed colleges can get only one exhibition, whilst the Queen's college student of the same standing, and perhaps less knowledge, can gain two exhibitions, or an exhibition and scholarship for one year, on condition of attending his course of lectures in the Queen's College, which is the very thing that a conscientious Catholic will not and cannot do. Is this equality or fair play ?

It is true, indeed, that University College has the advantage of having some twelve of the salaried Fellows of the Royal University assigned to it to teach in its halls. But this is the only advantage it has. It has not, like each of the Queen's Colleges, £1,500 a year to offer in prizes to its students. It has no buildings erected at the public expense, no libraries, no museums, no laboratories—so essential for medical and scientific teaching—no apparatus of any kind, no paid officers, none of the other aids to learning which are so liberally supplied to the Queen's Colleges. Surely this is not equality or fair play ; and surely the Catholic students of University College in this matter have a grievance that imperatively calls for redress. But there are other Catholic colleges which do more work and better work than either Cork or Galway that have a still greater grievance, for University College gets something, but they get nothing at all. Last year, 1888-89, there were only 41 students in the Faculty of Arts in the Queen's College, Cork, and 55 in Galway. During the last five years these Art Students of Cork College gained in the Royal University 21 exhibitions and 65 honours ; the Galway men during the same period gained 11 exhibitions and 52 honours ; whilst University College, Stephen's Green, gained

¹ See Dr. Moffat's Report for 1884-5, p. 17, and Dr. Porter's Evidence before the Commission of 1884, p. 4.

44 exhibitions and 168 honours ; and Blackrock University College secured nearly as many—37 exhibitions and 118 honours. It will thus be seen that of the highest kind of educational work each of the Catholic colleges has done more than the two Queen's Colleges taken together. Clongowes, Carlow, Mungret, St. Malachy's, Belfast, and other Catholic colleges have likewise a considerable number of University students, and frequently win the highest places in the lists of the Royal University. But not one of these colleges has one shilling of endowment, direct or indirect, from the public purse.

Is this equality, or fair play, or justice, or public economy, or anything else that it ought to be ? Will the Government perpetuate this state of things, or will they not rather give the money where the work is done without it, and where it will be much better done with it ; or, if they will retain Cork and Galway—as we think they ought to do—then, in the name of justice and common sense let them, as the bishops so often asked, so modify the constitution of these colleges that the Catholics of these two provinces can safely utilize them, and then we shall in a few years find them as successful in the South and West as Belfast has been in the North. Those who are most intimately acquainted with the working of the Royal University feel this injustice and this inequality most keenly, and we have reason to believe that there is not a single representative of the Queen's Colleges on the Senate of the Royal University who would not gladly see something done to remedy this glaring inequality. The Royal University has done this one signal service at all events ; it has proved to the world that the students of our Catholic colleges can more than hold their own against all comers if they get anything like fair play ; and it has also served to place in a clearer light before the world the great disadvantages under which our Catholic colleges necessarily send up their students to its examinations.

The second great drawback to the full success of the Royal University arises from the fact that its Fellows are at once teachers and examiners—that is, examiners both of their own students and of outsiders, who have not the advantage of attending to the course of lectures given by the examiners

in the very subjects in which they examine. This system is intrinsically dangerous to the impartiality of the examinations, for no matter how painstaking and conscientious the examiner may be, he is naturally inclined to set those questions which are before his own mind with special prominence, and to which he most likely called special attention in his own lectures. It is very obvious that in that case a student attending the course of lectures given by the examiner will have in most subjects a very decided advantage over the student who never heard that examiner open his lips. And when in answer to the questions put the examiner gets back his own views, he is more likely to think them correct in those subjects where a divergence of opinion is inevitable than the views of other men. It is very difficult, therefore, for the examiner to act with perfect impartiality as judge between the students taught by himself and those taught by another person in the same subjects. Even his very anxiety to be honest may cause him to be unfair to his own men, as we know to have sometimes happened, but generally speaking it will be the other way; an unconscious bias for his own views and opinions will lead him to set his own favourite questions, and to give perhaps more than their due weight to those answers in which they are carefully reproduced to his own great mental delectation. Considerations of this character are not forgotten by the Senators of the Royal University, and it is an undoubted fact that they are most anxious, as far as possible, to secure a set of examiners who would have nothing to do with the teaching of any of the candidates in those subjects in which they examine. With this view the Senate of the Royal University quite recently made a regulation that the examiners should not continue to examine in the same subject for a longer period than four consecutive years. This was done partly to give outsiders a chance, and partly to prevent the examinations running in the same groove for an indefinite period, with the obvious result that grinders and clever students made themselves perfectly up beforehand in all the points and crotchets of the examiner as exhibited in his questions and in his lectures. Yet an eminent Dublin doctor, who is a Senator of the Royal

University, and also a professor in one of the Dublin Schools of Medicine, bitterly complained of this regulation, because, although there were eight medical examiners of the Royal University in that school, yet in their turn they should have to vacate the office at least one year out of five, and thereby lose the salary which, it was alleged, was given to the examiners as an indirect endowment for that particular School of Medicine. This is precisely the root of the evil. The system of indirectly endowing a school or college by giving large salaries to its professors as university examiners, with the duty of testing the relative merits of their own pupils and of outsiders, is essentially a dangerous and unsatisfactory system. It cannot last in the Royal University, and it must be changed in the interests of justice and fair play. Endow the working colleges by all means, so as to place them on a footing of equality in coming up for the honours and rewards of the university, but let it be done some other way.

The present arrangement of Fellowships, as a means of giving a small indirect endowment to one or two colleges, was never intended to be permanent—it was a makeshift for the time, and served a useful purpose for a while, but the sooner it is got rid of the better for all parties concerned. The Archbishop of Dublin stated some years ago, as well as we recollect, that it was a system essentially based on injustice. We are very far from assenting to that proposition, but we think it is dangerous and open to abuse in spite of all the precautions that the Senate has undoubtedly adopted to prevent by every means in its power any possibility of unfairness. It is said by the defenders of the present system that in most subjects it is impossible to get competent university examiners, who are not also teachers of the same subjects, and some of whose pupils would not present themselves at the examinations of the Royal University. That may be—but the danger, at least, should be minimized. It is a standing rule of the Intermediate examinations, that no examiner can examine his own pupils in any subject which he has taught them, and we do not see why a similar rule could not apply to university examinations, with, perhaps, a very few exceptions.

It must be borne in mind, too, that although the first set of

Fellows in the Royal University were elected by the Senate without examination, still the Act of Parliament provides that the Fellowships, like the other prizes of the University, shall be open to all students matriculating, or who have matriculated in the university; and the scheme *may propose* that they shall be awarded in respect of either relative or absolute proficiency, etc. The Senate is anxiously awaiting the time when it will be free to throw open the Fellowships, like all other prizes, to the competition of its own graduates; and there is no doubt that such free competition would be for the "Advancement of Learning in Ireland." But this can never be done while the Senate continues to impose the obligation of teaching in certain colleges on a fixed number of the Fellows. Suppose a number of vacancies occurred, as they did lately in University College, and a Belfast graduate, or two or three of them in succession happened to win the Fellowships, it would be highly inconvenient to send them to teach in University College, Stephen's Green, and if the Senate did not do so that institution would lose the endowment previously derived from these Fellowships. It is obvious, therefore, that the existing system of indirect endowment is unsatisfactory in many ways, and must, in fact, be done away with as soon as possible.

And now arises the most important question of all—What is to take its place? We have neither the right nor the duty to undertake to give a positive answer to this weighty question. But the past history of the question will enable us to guess very well, what will not do, and even to conjecture with some probability, certain concessions that would certainly tend to a solution of the difficulty.

First of all, it must be borne in mind that the Irish Catholics in this matter of university education now demand, and have always demanded, to be placed on a footing of equality—perfect equality—with their fellow subjects of other religious denominations. This has again been asserted in all the resolutions drawn up by the Irish prelates for the last forty years, and it has been asserted with more emphasis of late years than ever. Many persons, it is well known, are by no means over-anxious to press the Catholic claims in this matter on the Imperial

Parliament, lest perchance Parliament might at length do justice to Ireland in this matter, and thereby weaken the argument in favour of Home Rule. If Mr. Balfour, after his declaration in the House of Commons, can not, or will not, induce his party to settle this question, then all we can say is, that such a fact will furnish an unanswerable argument in favour of the need of Home Rule for Ireland, and will strike a heavier blow at the Union than it ever received before. If the thing, as all concede, ought to be done, and you admit that still you cannot do it in London, then, in the name of common sense, let us try our hands in Dublin. At any rate, our failure cannot be more signal than yours has been.

But what, it may be asked, is this equality that you want ? How are we to measure or to gauge it ? We think it is mainly a matter of statistics. What is the actual number of Catholic and non-Catholic university students in Ireland, including the students of Maynooth, who will and ought to graduate in Arts where they can do so in a becoming way ? And, secondly, What would be the relative proportion of these students, if the Catholics had got for the last generation the same facilities for obtaining university education as their non-Catholic fellow-countrymen ? Let these questions be answered, and it will be found that the Catholics are entitled to get at least as large an endowment as all non-Catholic students taken together. If Trinity College gets £40,000 a year, are not the Catholics entitled to as much ? Nay, they should, in fair play, get more, for the endowments of Trinity College are reserved for the wealthier classes, who, as a rule, are perfectly well able to take care of themselves, and go anywhere they choose for a university education. It must be borne in mind, too, that a much larger number of Roman Catholics would strive to secure a university degree, both of the professional and non-professional classes, if the same facilities for acquiring a university education were offered to them as are offered to their Protestant fellow-subjects. It is the case in Scotland, where there is one university student for 860 of the population ; and why should it not be also the case in Ireland, where at present the proportion is only one in 2,800 of the population ? There is no doubt, too, that with the more equal distribution of property in

Ireland, and the increasing wealth and independence of the middle classes, a much greater number, of Catholics especially, will, in the coming years, try to give their sons a university education than have attempted to do so in the past. All these considerations go to show that at least as ample provision should be made for the endowment of Catholic education in the future as has already been made for the endowment of non-Catholic. If the question of principle is once honestly and fairly conceded, then all must admit that the educational provision made should be adequate and liberal, if it were only to make some reparation for the spoliation and injustice of the past.

But there is another point which is far more essential than the amount of the endowment, and that is the conditions under which it is to be given. Here, too, we may learn much from the history of the past. If Mr. Balfour will not follow in the footsteps of Lord Mayo, who offered to charter an independent and self-sufficing university for Catholics, but prefers to follow the example of Sir George Grey, he will do well to take careful note of the objections that were raised to that scheme, and ultimately caused it to be withdrawn. If a Catholic college (without the power of giving degrees) were to be chartered and endowed, the Bishops not only required such an endowment as would place them on a footing of equality with non-Catholics, but also that it should be chartered "in such a manner as to leave the department of teaching Catholics altogether in the hands of Catholics, and under the control of the bishops, at least in all things appertaining to faith and morals." There can be no doubt that the bishops will still insist on this as an essential condition. They have always insisted on it; if it were not granted the college, or colleges, would be only Catholic in name, not in reality. You cannot have the play without Hamlet; you cannot have a Catholic college without effective episcopal control in those things, which essentially and exclusively appertain to episcopal authority. There may be a possibility of compromise in other things, but not in this. As the bishops pointed out most distinctly, both to Sir George Grey and Lord Mayo, it would necessarily imply in a Catholic college the power of vetoing

the appointment or continuance in office of heterodox or immoral professors, the use of bad or immoral books, as well as all lectures of an anti-Catholic or irreligious tendency. It would, in all probability, be very seldom necessary to exercise this power, but its possession would be an essential safeguard for the working of a Catholic college, and would of itself render it unnecessary in most cases to have recourse to its exercise.

This power, therefore, must *in some way* be secured to the representatives of the Catholic Hierarchy in the government of every Catholic college. But in whom is it to be immediately vested? In the statement submitted by the Archbishop of Cashel and the Bishop of Clonfert, in the name of their colleagues, they suggest that this power should be given to the bishops on the Senate of the Catholic University College; but in the Draft Charter which was sent to Sir George Grey in the name of all the bishops, and which was probably drawn up by Cardinal Cullen (see his "Collected Works," Vol. II., p. 460), it was proposed: "That the four Roman Catholic archbishops for the time being shall be visitors of the said college, and their authority shall be supreme in questions regarding religion or morals, and in all other things in the said college."

There can be no doubt that the latter would be the simplest and perhaps the most satisfactory way of securing to the bishops that supreme control in all those things relating to faith and morals which has been indicated above. It would be found very inconvenient in practice to give to the episcopal members of the Senate a power which was not shared by their clerical or lay colleagues on the same Board. No doubt the members of the Senate—especially of a Catholic Senate—would generally defer at once to the ascertained views of the bishops on questions of this kind. But by reserving an appeal to the archiepiscopal visitors, if any difficulty arose, and holding their decision as final, every objection would be removed, and the rights of the Hierarchy in faith and morals would be effectively safeguarded. And surely when there is a question of a Catholic college nothing can be more natural than to have ecclesiastical Visitors, and it might very fairly be assumed that they would not act in any narrow or illiberal spirit, and that

whatever might be their prejudices, as churchmen or politicians, when they were appealed to as judges, they would temper justice with mercy, and act in a spirit of large-minded equity. It has been suggested that in that case it would be useful to add to the four Catholic archbishops one or two of the Catholic judges whose knowledge and experience would be valuable on questions of law, and who, doubtless, would not be over-anxious to mix themselves up in questions of faith and morals. The supreme control would still be effectively secured according to Catholic principles to the episcopal authority. This is a point on which we cannot offer any definite opinion ; but it is obvious that in the way which the bishops themselves have indicated in the Draft Charter may be found a simple and easy solution of this critical question.

It was also provided by the same Draft Charter that the " four Visitors shall be trustees of all property belonging to the College." They were also to be *ex-officio* perpetual governors of the College, and eight other prelates were to be associated with them as life-governors of the institution ; but it was not proposed to give a share in the " government " to any layman or cleric of the second order. Many people will doubtless consider that a Senate composed exclusively of bishops is more suited for the government of an ecclesiastical college than of a Catholic University College, primarily established and endowed with public money for the education of laymen. And it is satisfactory to find that in their negotiations with Sir George Grey, the bishops did not insist on this point, and were ready to admit a certain number of laymen to a share in the government of the College, but they preferred to have them elected by the Senate itself, rather than by the Convocation of Graduates.

The important point is that, although the bishops would prefer a Catholic University of their own, with the power of granting degrees, they were willing to accept an Incorporated college within the new university endowed by Government so as to place it on a footing of equality with other institutions, and at the same time with effective episcopal control over its teaching, its books, and its morals. There is, we presume, no reason, either in policy or the nature of things, why Mr.

Balfour could not incorporate a Catholic college as well as Sir George Grey ; and there is every reason in the nature of things why a Conservative statesman should be more friendly to such an institution than either a Liberal or a Radical—the latter being, as a rule, the avowed champions of a mixed or godless education. It was, in fact, a Conservative, Sir R. Inglis, who first applied to the Queen's Colleges the opprobrious epithet of "godless" colleges.

And if a central Catholic college is to be chartered, there can be no real objection to allow the Chartered college to affiliate a limited number of other Catholic colleges to itself. The Government in 1866 alleged that this was the peculiar privilege of a university, forgetting that it was proposed in 1846 by the Government of the day to allow the Queen's Colleges to affiliate to themselves certain medical schools as tributaries and feeders.¹ This affiliation, after all, really means very little, and can hardly lead to any serious abuse in the lowering of the educational standard, seeing that neither the students of the Central college, nor of the affiliated colleges, can obtain any University degrees or diplomas, or certificates, except by passing the examinations of an external and perfectly independent tribunal, which is open to all comers on equal terms. Let the Senate, or other governing body of the Incorporated college, fix, subject to the approval of the Lord Lieutenant, the conditions and privileges of affiliation, restricting it carefully to those institutions where the staff, the numbers, the appliances, and the work already accomplished, will clearly show that they are competent to afford university instruction to their students. Let them be required, if necessary, to come up for certain courses of lectures to the Central college ; let some, but not all, the scholarships and exhibitions of the Central college be thrown open for competition amongst the entire body of the students of the affiliated colleges, and be tenable for one year in the affiliated college, but for a second or third year only in the Central college. We do not see how there can be any objection to such a system of affiliation so conditioned and restricted. It has nothing at all to do with the religious question, and

¹ See Sir James Graham's "Official Memorandum," Jan. 1846.

we are quite certain that it would greatly tend to the development and success of the Central college, as well as to the general advancement of learning in Ireland.

Let there be by all means but one Central college thoroughly well equipped for all the educational work, which it will have to perform. Let it have a complete staff of competent professors with liberal salaries, for otherwise the services of the most competent men cannot be secured. We do not want any endowment for theological chairs out of the taxpayers' money ; let the theological faculty, as at present, be confined to the College of Maynooth. But a very large sum will be required for the purchase or construction of suitable collegiate buildings, and an equally large sum for their complete equipment—that is, including library, museum, laboratories, and all the other varied and expensive educational appliances necessary in the medical and scientific departments. £100,000 was granted by Parliament as a first instalment for the building of the Queen's Colleges, and they have been receiving large sums for maintenance every year since. It would take a very considerable sum to build a hall at all approaching in grandeur the magnificent library of Trinity College. Yet this is a thing that can hardly be done piecemeal—it ought to be done at once.

Such a college thoroughly equipped and amply endowed would, in a short time, attract to its halls all the Catholic youths in Ireland seeking a university education. We do not believe there are fifty Catholics in all Ireland who would by preference send their sons either to Trinity College or the Queen's Colleges if they had such an institution in Dublin. It is not for love of mixed education that a few persons do send their sons to these colleges at present, but because many of them have practically no choice. Such a great Catholic college would realize in a brief time Cardinal Newman's lofty ideal by its influence in raising the intellectual tone of society, in cultivating the public mind, in purifying the national taste, in supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm, and fixed aims to popular aspiration, in giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, in facilitating the exercise of political power, and refining the intercourse of private life. Residence for a shorter or longer

period in this clear and pure atmosphere of sober thought should be made indispensable for obtaining all its higher academic prizes.

This is our grievance—that at present we have examinations enough and to spare in the Royal University ; but we have no adequate means of preparing for them—no centre of light and culture for the teaching and residence of our students, which alone can give a truly liberal education. Residence without examinations, said Newman, comes nearer to the idea of a university than examinations without residence. On this point we have very striking official testimony from Lord Emly, the present distinguished Vice-Chancellor of the Royal University. “ For the majority of the people (of Ireland),” he says, “ not one endowed lay college exists, and consequently the majority of our students of the Royal University are absolutely shut out from university and college life. They have to compete with their fellow-countrymen—English, Irish, and Scotch—and enter into the combat of life at grievous disadvantage. Until these students, who are now scattered through Stephen’s Green, Blackrock, Carlow, and other unendowed colleges, badly equipped, insufficiently manned, and struggling with penury, are united together in a college, *in all respects equal to Trinity College*, they cannot be on an intellectual level with their fellow-countrymen. We have a striking instance of this inferiority before our eyes. Look at our university calendar ; you will be struck by the fact that while in other branches of the university course the students of the unendowed colleges have earned a fair proportion of prizes and honours—in mathematical science they have hardly won any.” Why ? for want of suitable appliances and competent professors.

Yes, that is exactly what we want—“ a thoroughly equipped college, in all respects equal to Trinity College.” This is not, perhaps, the place to discuss its constitution or its government. Mr. Balfour has before him, in the proposals submitted to Sir George Grey and in the Draft Charter, ample means of ascertaining what is likely to be accepted as a satisfactory working arrangement. Lord Mayo, too, laid down one invaluable principle, equally applicable, whether there be question of a

Catholic college or of a Catholic university. " If, therefore, a Catholic university is founded, it should be constituted in such a manner that, while it would be almost independent of State control, it would be subject to a constant influence of public opinion, and governed by a body, who, acting in the light of day, would be likely to frame its rules and conduct its teaching so that the new university (or college) would at once enter into active competition on equal terms with the older universities " or colleges of the kingdom.

There is not a single clause in this sentence that does not enumerate an important principle, to which no friend of education can reasonably take exception. No university college, and least of all a Catholic college, should be a mere Government *lycée*, managed by a Minister of Public Instruction, or by any other official of the Government. The interference of the Government ought to be limited to two things—to start it and keep it in working order ; or, better still, to endow and constitute it so that the institution will be self-governing and self-sustaining, and thus be enabled to keep itself in working order. Competition and publicity will do the rest. Hence we think that the principle of independence of State control laid down in the first paragraph is an admirable one. The less the Government has to do with such an institution once it is fairly started the better. No doubt it is the right and the duty of the Government to see that the country gets value for its money, and that a college endowed from the public purse does not become the nursery of sloth and incompetence. But the examinations of such a body as the Royal University will effectively and clearly tell the world what is the quantity and quality of the work done. It has already shown this in the case of the Queen's Colleges. Belfast has been shown to be a successful institution ; so successful that no one grudges its endowment, or questions its right to what it has, or even to more, if necessary, for its efficient working. The Royal University has already done the same for our Catholic colleges. It has shown clearly the quantity and quality of the work done, and will, in the near future, as we hope, be a still more efficient and impartial *jury d'examen* for all the rival colleges in the country.

But it is also of supreme importance that the Government should commit the management of the new college to a body that will command the public confidence, both as Catholics and as educationalists. The " advancement of learning on a sound Catholic basis " is the whole purpose of its existence ; and this, doubtless, will be best secured by the choice of moderate men representing the various political parties, but about whose Catholicity and culture and educational experience there can be no question.

It will be observed that the prelates always demanded that the Queen's Colleges should be so modified as to make them practically denominational colleges. In the case of Belfast that is so already—not, indeed, in theory, but certainly in practice ; and therefore Belfast is a success. It has been so from the beginning. They began there with four Catholic students who matriculated in the year 1849-50 ; for the next twenty-one years the average number was only three ; and we believe that is about the number down to the present time. The staff was from the very beginning mainly Presbyterian ; some few, it is true, were Episcopalians, but there was only one Catholic, and his might be called an honorary chair, given to save appearances. It was the chair of Celtic, which was filled by John O'Donovan, the illustrious editor and translator of the *Annals of the Four Masters*. But the working staff then and since has been to a great extent Presbyterian. Dr. Henry, the first President, was a Presbyterian ; Dr. Andrews, the Vice-President, was a Presbyterian ; and the majority of the remaining officers and professors were Presbyterians. Using the wider inclusive term of Protestant, every single officer and professor on the establishment, with the single exception of O'Donovan, was a Protestant, and that has been the practice down to the present time. There can be no difficulty about giving Belfast to the Presbyterians ; it is theirs already, and they know it well, and have claimed its Presidency as such from Mr. Balfour.

The question is about Cork and Galway. Is it statesman-like to leave them as they are in the midst of a Catholic population, who would most gladly avail themselves of the educational facilities which they afford if they were conducted

on denominational principles ? Let them become Catholic as Belfast is Protestant, governed by Catholics, taught by Catholics and frequented by Catholics, with the sanction of their pastors, and all will be well. Let there be, by all means, a conscience clause which will secure, as Lord Mayo proposed, "that no religious influence should be brought to bear on students who belonged to another faith." If any non-Catholic students living in Cork or Belfast choose to attend lectures in these colleges when under Catholic management, so long as they are endowed with public money, they cannot reasonably be excluded—at least so long as they have no college of their own in the same city. And they are entitled to be secured against any undue religious influence being brought to bear upon them against their own wish, or the wish of their parents and guardians. They are entitled to this much ; but they are entitled to no more. They have Trinity College if they are Episcopalians ; they have Belfast if they are Presbyterians ; but it cannot reasonably be expected that they should also have Cork and Galway governed and officered according to their views, so as to meet their wants. The Catholics also, who compose the great bulk of the population, especially in these two provinces, must be taken account of, and something must be done to provide for them so as to meet their wants and wishes. They ask for nothing unreasonable, for nothing, strictly speaking, exclusive—they merely ask for equality ; give us in our way as much as you give our Protestant fellow-subjects in their way ; that is all.

There is one objection we heard brought against this scheme, that considerable private endowments for various useful purposes were given to Cork College, especially as a mixed college, and on the faith that it would continue to be a mixed college, and which never would have been given by the donors if they imagined it were to become a practically Catholic college. It would be unjust and unfair, they say, to divert these legacies to purposes for which they were never intended. Our answer is that it would be still more unfair to allow such a reason to obstruct the performance of a great act of public justice. There need be no shadow of wrong done to these benefactors of Cork or Galway either, if it has any. If either

themselves or their representatives should object to the proposed changes in the constitution of these colleges, then, we say, let the Government pay them over the amount of the original benefaction, whatever it was, and they cannot complain of the least shadow of wrong or injustice. So far as they are concerned, they get back their own to do what they please with, and they can ask for nothing more in reason.

There is a double argument of the greatest weight in favour of this change, first, that it is due as a matter of plain justice to Catholics, for otherwise they will not be placed on an equality with non-Catholics. But there is the second equally imperative argument, that under the present system these two colleges are a failure, and will continue to be a failure so long as that system is continued. It does not need many words to prove this proposition. It has been proved again and again, and has, indeed, been repeatedly admitted by friends as well as by enemies. The Rev. John Scott Porter, in his evidence before the Royal Commission, so far back as March, 1857, says: "I do not think that the number now attending all the three Queen's Colleges as great—certainly not greater—than ought to be found in one of the three if they had succeeded as their founders anticipated, and as we their friends expected." The numbers, however, in Belfast have, since that period, steadily increased; especially of late years, its success has been very marked. On the other hand, Cork and Galway have been going from bad to worse. The examinations of the Royal University conclusively prove that some of the Catholic colleges which do not derive a shilling from the public purse do better work, and have more students in their halls than either of these richly-endowed colleges which cost the nation nearly £12,000 a year each.

Mr. Balfour if he is to be taken as quite serious in the speech which he made on the 2nd of December, at Partick, places himself in a very inconsistent position. He practically admits everything that we have been arguing for in these pages, in favour of Catholics—indeed, he makes a stronger case for justice to Catholics than any Minister ever made before, yet declares it is absolutely impossible for him to do anything except with general consent, and so hampers his proposals

with extraordinary conditions that it is impossible to regard them as anything but illusory. He finds that there are four colleges in Ireland enjoying public endowments, yet, although the Catholics form the great majority of the population, only one in seven of the students in these colleges belongs to the Catholic faith. He admits that for conscience sake they have absented themselves from these colleges, and prefer at considerable sacrifice and expense to attend their own unendowed colleges in Dublin and elsewhere. There are, at least, one thousand Catholics receiving a university education in these institutions, while there are not two hundred and fifty in the four richly-endowed State colleges. He admits that, as we pointed out, Trinity College, though not exclusively Protestant, is mainly a seat of Protestant learning, having only six per cent. of its students Roman Catholic. It is, in fact, now what it has always been, a great Protestant institution in its composition, flavour, and complexion. He admits that Belfast, though in theory unsectarian, is practically a Presbyterian College, in which the vast majority of the students are Presbyterian, and a great number of them are being educated for the Presbyterian ministry. He has nothing at all to say in favour of Cork and Galway, and his silence is their strongest condemnation. He admits, too, that in Ireland the current of popular feeling is strongly in favour of denominational colleges and schools of every kind. The present, he admits, is not a creditable state of things. The Roman Catholics ought to get a thoroughly well-equipped college, so as to obviate their undoubtedly conscientious objections to the existing institutions. But, admitting all this, he will not touch the question except with the consent of all parties in the State.

If Mr. Balfour merely said that he was not prepared to make this a Cabinet question, seeing the avowed attitude of many of those for whose benefit this great boon is intended, we confess that in our opinion he could not be blamed. No one can expect him to forge a weapon which might be used to strike down his own Government, and it has been avowed that it would most assuredly be so used if opportunity offered. As a matter of fact, too, we think his proposals are more likely to meet with

general acceptance when his adversaries know that they can be withdrawn without injury to the strength and prestige of the Government.

But the Minister goes much further than this, and lays down three conditions precedent to any action on his part, which he frankly admits are altogether unlikely to be fulfilled. First, he requires his proposals to be cordially accepted as a solution of higher educational difficulty ; secondly, his adversaries must not take advantage of his proposals as a means of striking a political blow at the Government ; and thirdly, there must be a general consensus of opinion amongst Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen in favour of granting this particular boon to the Roman Catholics. Heretofore it was considered enough to have the opinion of the majority in Parliament in favour of a measure, but we must now have the general opinion of three Kingdoms in favour of this particular measure, including, we presume, extreme Radicals and extreme Orangemen. We are not disposed to be too hard on Mr. Balfour's conditions, because we know the difficulties he has to deal with, and the prejudices he has to overcome. But the least we might expect is, that without at all endangering his Government, he might make an honest effort to solve this question. Coercion is not the whole duty of a Minister. Distributive justice has something to do with it. Has not he himself declared that " there is no task to which the Government of the United Kingdom might more fitly devote itself than that of passing measures for the amelioration of the condition of our brethren in Ireland, which might raise to prosperity those in misery and diminish the friction which unhappily exists between the classes ? " This is a lofty purpose, but how is it to be accomplished ? Not surely by Drainage Bills, or Railway Bills, or even Land Purchase Bills alone. There is another means—a most efficacious means—of elevating the Irish people that the Minister, both in justice and policy, is bound to adopt. " It is indisputable," said Sir Lyon Playfair, a most competent authority " that poor countries require greater facilities for education than rich ones ; and that the *only* way in which a poor country with no natural resources can be made prosperous is by extending the demand for intellectual labour,

so as to compensate for the absence of material industry. . . . With small material resources, except those for agriculture, it is above all things essential that the intellectual resources of Ireland should supplement her natural resources."

Let Mr. Balfour make an honest effort to give us the capital necessary to work these rich intellectual resources of Ireland, which we so much want. Of the 715 candidates for examination in Arts in the Royal University, only 173 came from the endowed colleges during the year 1887-88 ; the remaining 542 came from the unendowed colleges or from private tuition. It is just and wise to give these students the same material advantages to aid in developing their intellectual resources as the minority already possess. It is something far more important, and more statesmanlike than either drainage or railways in the congested districts. Let us hope that Mr. Balfour in his latest speech was only striving to educate his own followers. He knows well that on this question the Union is on its trial, and that if the Imperial Parliament persistently denies us, Irish Catholics, those educational advantages which he and every other statesman of name admits we are entitled to, so much the worse for the claim of that Imperial Parliament to rule Ireland. If the men who keep the vast revenues of Trinity College intact will give nothing to the Catholics of Ireland, the day will surely come when Trinity College will have to disgorge and give us our proportionate share. Mr. Balfour has already proved that as an administrator he is not afraid of Mr. Healy or Mr. Davitt, and he need not fear them in this matter either. There is a limit beyond which even they dare not go. It is a noble task for any statesman—to overcome prejudice and religious intolerance, to diffuse the blessings of equal and impartial law throughout the Empire, and accomplish that task, so often tried in vain, of doing justice to Irish Catholics in this matter of university education by placing them on a footing of perfect equality with their fellow-citizens of other religious denominations.

ST. LIVINUS, BISHOP AND MARTYR.

AMONGST the most celebrated of our Irish saints who left their native land to preach the Gospel, and who sealed their testimony with their blood, was Livinus, "Bishop and Martyr." His festival is found amongst the proper Offices of the Irish Saints on the 12th of November, and the Lessons of the Office give a brief account of his life and martyrdom. But, strange to say, so far as I know, there is no certain reference to Livinus in our domestic records. And this is still more remarkable, seeing that we have a full and authentic life of the Saint from other sources, which purports to give an account of his early life at home, as well as of his subsequent missionary career. With a view of inducing some of our learned readers to throw some further light, if possible, on the early history of this distinguished saint, I will give a sketch of his career as recorded in the Latin life already referred to.

It appears to me, after a careful perusal of this life, that it is, notwithstanding a few apparent inconsistencies, the authentic and trustworthy narrative of a contemporary writer.

The author in his preface calls himself "Boniface, a sinful man, the servant of the servants of Jesus Christ." He was apparently the inmate of some religious house in which the memory of Livinus was yearly celebrated with much pomp and ceremony; and it was, he says, the recurrence of that festival of their sainted father and high priest Livinus that filled their hearts with joy and prompted him to proclaim the glories of his triumphant passion. He felt himself, indeed, unequal to the task, and was, therefore, unwilling to undertake it; but he could not resist the passionate entreaties of Foillan, Helias,¹ and Kilian,² the three disciples of Livinus, who always closely followed his footsteps both at home and abroad, and

¹ Helyas.

² Kilyanus, Kylianus.

who knelt down on the ground and kissing his hands and embracing his knees besought him with many prayers and tears to write the life of their beloved father, and preserve it for the edification of posterity. It was from the narrative of these three most intimate disciples, as the writer expressly informs us, that he collected his information regarding the Saint. Although these faithful sons of Ireland, who followed their beloved master in all his labours and wanderings, might greatly extol the virtues of their spiritual father and the wonders which he wrought, we cannot for a moment doubt that they furnished on the whole a truthful and accurate narrative of the life and labours of Livinus. And we may be certain, too, that Boniface, though writing in a wordy and somewhat turgid style, gives us, as he undertook to do, a faithful version of all that he had heard from the companions of Livinus.

This life has been attributed to the great St. Boniface of Mentz, the apostle of Germany. But as St. Boniface received his mission about 718 from the Pope, and became archbishop only in 738, it is difficult to see how he could have got his facts from the companions of St. Livinus who flourished nearly a century before. Neither do we think that the style of this life at all resembles that of the letters and other undoubted writings of the archbishop.

The reader will observe that Boniface, the writer of this Life of St. Livinus, latinises the Irish names in such a way as to render it very difficult to ascertain the corresponding terms of the original Irish. This is true in many other cases also. Lorcan, for instance, is very different from Laurentius, the Latin name of the great St. Laurence O'Toole. Fearghal, abbot of Aghaboe, is not easily recognisable as Virgilius, the renowned prelate of Salzburg; and certainly, at first sight, no one would think of identifying the Irish name Adannan with its classical form of Eunan. Many other similar instances might be adduced of Latin names very different from the Irish originals. It is specially difficult for foreigners to catch the correct sound of the Irish names, and that sound is frequently altogether different from the phonetic sound of the written words. If we add to this the errors of careless or

ignorant copyists, it will not be difficult to explain the curious Latin terms that are exhibited in many documents as the equivalent of well-known Gaelic names. In the present case I have failed to identify any of the Latin names with known personages in Irish history, and I should feel thankful to any Irish scholar who could suggest a satisfactory explanation of the Latin names given by the writer of the Life of St. Livinus. Where there are different forms of the name in the various copies of the Life, we shall mark them in the notes in order to facilitate identification.

The writer begins by stating that in the reign of Calomagnus,¹ the illustrious king of the Scots, Theagnius, by birth a Scot,² was the king's most intimate counsellor and the first noble of his kingdom. This Theagnius was married to a noble matron called Agalmia,³ equally distinguished by her birth and by her virtues, for she was the daughter of a most illustrious Irish king, and, like her husband, faithfully served God by the practice of every virtue. The father of Agalmia is called by the writer Ephigenius, "*Hibernensium rex clarissimus*," but Calomagnus is called "*rex Scotorum*." It is true indeed that both Adamnan and Bede use *Hibernia* and *Scotia* as interchangeable terms, but we do not recollect to have seen the words *Hibernenses* and *Scoti* used as equivalent terms by the same writer.

One night a wondrous vision appeared both to Agalmia and her husband. A dove of milky whiteness was seen to float down from heaven on radiant pinions, and alighting on the head of her couch dropped what seemed to be three drops of milk on the lips of the holy matron, and then soared swiftly aloft to heaven. The chamber and the palace were filled immediately with a celestial fragrance, that diffused itself around and typified the odour of those heavenly virtues which hereafter were to adorn the character of her yet unborn child.

Now at this time Menalchius,⁴ a man of singular holiness, was archpontiff, and was, moreover, the brother of Theagnius, the husband of Agalmia. He was sent for to explain this

¹ Otherwise Calomannus.

² Scotigena.

³ Agaluina.

⁴ Monalchius.

wondrous vision, and he told the joyous parents that their child would one day become a great pontiff, the shining light of many nations, and their guide to eternal salvation.

It came to pass that at this very time the Blessed Augustine, a man of wondrous holiness, who had been sent to convert the English, by the Blessed Pope Gregory, went over about his own business to the court of the aforesaid King Calomagnus. He also heard the wondrous tale of the celestial vision, and together with Menalchius assisted at the baptism of the child, to whom his parents gave the name of Livinus, because it was the name of his mother's brother, a great archbishop of the Irish Church,¹ who had died the death of a glorious martyr for the name of Christ amongst the people called Humbrani.²

The writer here appears to be most accurate and specific in his statements, yet it is very difficult, indeed quite impossible, to reconcile the fact that Livinus was baptised in infancy by St. Augustine of Canterbury, with what he says further on that Livinus was trained under St. Augustine for five years and three months, and then ordained priest by the same great pontiff. For St. Augustine was not more than twelve years in England altogether—from 597 to 608 or perhaps 609. How then could he have been present at the baptism of the child in infancy, and live to ordain him priest? We suspect that Goscelinus, who wrote the Life of St. Augustine towards the close of the eleventh century, and was himself a monk of Canterbury, furnishes the true explanation. He says that St. Augustine assisted Menalchius at the baptism of Livinus, who was *then a boy*.³ Goscelinus saw the inconsistency of St. Augustine's baptising Livinus in infancy, and at the same time ordaining him priest, and hence implies that he was baptised in his boyhood, perhaps when he was fifteen or sixteen years of age. Boniface, the writer of the Life, heard that Livinus was baptised by St. Augustine, and because infant baptism was the rule, he wrongly concluded that Livinus was also baptised shortly after his birth.

¹ Hibernensis ecclesiae archiepiscopus. ² Otherwise Verbanus.

³ "Beatum Livinum tunc puerum cum sancto Menalchio pontifice baptizaverit."

On the other hand it is difficult to suppose that his pious parents and his uncle the archbishop, would have allowed the child to grow up without baptism for several years, except indeed the ceremony had been performed in infancy, but some doubts as to its validity having arisen, the ceremony was subsequently repeated. Strange too, that Bede makes no reference to these facts nor to Augustine's visit to Calomagnus, although both the writer of this *Life* and Goscelinus so explicitly refer to these events.

But whether the baptism took place in infancy or boyhood, Boniface distinctly asserts that St. Augustine did visit Calomagnus, the renowned king of the Scots, and the same statement is repeated by Goscelinus, when writing too in Canterbury itself so early as the eleventh century.

We cannot dwell at much length on the glowing account of the great virtues and wondrous miracles which Boniface attributes to St. Livinus even in his youth. A ray of light, he tells, brighter than the golden sun, shone round his head when the child was baptised and a voice from heaven proclaimed how dear he was to God. He expelled the demon on Pentecost Sunday in presence of his parents and of a great crowd from two men who were dragged before him chained with iron chains. One was named Herimus, the other Simphronius; and they afterwards lived in great holiness until their death. His nurse, Salvia by name, died after a few days' sickness, and her soul was being led to judgment, but the prayers of the holy youth Livinus caused the angels to bring back the departed soul, and she sat up and gave thanks to God in the presence of all those who stood around the bier.

During these years of his youth he was trained in learning and discipline by the Blessed Benignus, a priest belonging to one of the noblest families of the Scotie nobility. Livinus was taught by this holy man the melodious Psalms of David, the lessons of Gospel wisdom, and the perfect path that leads from virtue to virtue unto the full vision of the God of Sion.

But vain crowds now began to gather round Livinus—he was disturbed in his meditations, and he was afraid that the love of human applause might sap the edifice of Christian

virtue in his soul. So he resolved to leave his home secretly and retire from the world. In company with his three beloved disciples, Foillan, Helias, and Kilian, he sought that solitude which is so dear to the saints. They tore their way through brakes and pathless thickets into the very heart of the primeval forest, where they built themselves huts of boughs, giving all their thoughts to God, and living contentedly on herbs and wild apples, with scanty draughts of muddy water.¹ Of earthly goods they had none, for they gave all to the poor. To us, at least, it appears by no means surprising, that men who led such lives for God's sake should cast out demons, and even raise the dead to life.

Livinus was moreover a skilful hand at copying books,² and devoted most of his time in the desert to this pursuit, in order, says Boniface, that he might procure something to give the poor. But men now found out where he was, and even the king and his nobles came to visit him, and the king offered him much wealth for religious purposes and for his own soul's sake. But this only disturbed the thoughts of the servant of God, for he feared vain glory, and he was very anxious in mind, and he knew not what to do—only he had recourse to God by prayer.

Then an angel of God appeared to him, and said: "Hail, brother Livinus, cease to be troubled in mind, for the time of consolation is at hand; go thou to the blessed Bishop Augustine, from whose teaching and pious instructions you will derive much spiritual comfort and profit." Then Livinus, obedient to the messenger of heaven, with the king's permission left his home, and came to the great sea which he had no means of crossing. But a radiant angel stood beside him and said: "fear not, follow me, I am he whom Almighty God hath appointed as the guardian of thy life." And so Livinus and his three companions, Foillan, Helias, and Kilian, confidently following God's angel, walked across the sea with dry feet, and it seemed all the while to them that they were walking through green meadows, fresh with all the

¹ "Herbis, et silvestribus pomis, aquarumque turbidarum parca libatione contentus."

² "Scriptor peritus erat."

herbs of Spring, and fragrant with the odours of the roses and lilies.

And so Livinus came to the Blessed Augustine, who knew from the Spirit that he was coming, and who received him with the most tender kindness, and trained him in literature for five years and three months. Then he raised Livinus to the dignity of the holy priesthood, and gave him on the day of his ordination a purple chasuble, worked with wondrous skill in gems and gold, and likewise a priestly stole, with precious stones inwrought—to be a pledge of the undying mutual love of the master and the disciple.

After this Livinus, bidding farewell to the Blessed Augustine, returned to his own country, and was received with great joy by the king, and by his nobles, and by all the people. A short time before, his uncle Menalchius, the archbishop, had died, to the great grief of his entire flock. But now that Livinus had returned, he was deemed by all most worthy to succeed his uncle, and he was accordingly consecrated archbishop with the sanction both of the clergy and of the people. And a faithful and zealous pontiff he proved to be, feeding the people with the word of life, constant in labour, earnest in exhortation, vigilant in watchfulness. He continued, too, to work many miracles, for he cured a paralytic leper, Abdias by name; and once when walking near the sea, by his prayers the angry tempest was quelled, and sinking mariners brought safe to shore. Even the shadow of his body and the touch of his garments healed the sick and infirm, so that the fame of his sanctity and miracles spread abroad, and “not only the Scottish and the British nation, but also the Irish people,”¹ heard his praises, and came in crowds to hearken to the words of life from his mouth.

This curious passage would certainly seem to imply that the gens Scotica was different from the Hibernenses populi, and consequently that Calomagnus was King of the Albanian Scots, which was then a young colony from Ireland, not yet established in Scotland much more than a hundred years. In that case Livinus would have been also a Scot, born -

¹ “Quatenus non solum Scotica gens et Britannica, verum quoque et Hibernenses populi, etc.”

somewhere in Argyle, although the writer expressly tells us that his mother was the daughter of an Irish king, and that his maternal uncle was an Irish archbishop, named like himself Livinus, who had been martyred amongst the Humbrani—in all probability the Pagan Saxons who dwelt along the Humber. But who then was Calomagnus, King of the Albanian Scots? and who was the Irish “archbishop” Livinus, martyred “apud Humbranos?” These are questions, to which it is not easy to give a satisfactory answer. Again, if Livinus were of the Scottish Dalriads, how would he have to cross the “great sea” on his journey to Canterbury?—except, perhaps, he came from one of the Western Isles, or was stopped in his journey by the Solway Firth.

But Livinus felt that he had a call from God to preach to the heathen, and he was ready to meet a martyr's death. The purple chasuble which Augustine gave him was to be dyed in a brighter hue. His uncle, whose name he bore, was a martyr for the faith, and the noble Celtic aspiration—*peregrinari pro Christo*—filled his soul. He could not, however, leave his flock without a shepherd, and accordingly he invested the Archdeacon Sylvanus with full powers to rule the diocese during his absence, and then set out with the same three companions on his missionary journey.

We are not informed of the time or place of his departure, nor the route which he followed at first. We are merely told that after travelling through many districts, preaching the Gospel, and working many wonders, he came to the monastery of St. Peter at Ghent, which had been founded not long before by the holy Bishop Amandus on a spot that had been previously devoted to idolatrous worship. Flobertus, whom St. Amandus had appointed abbot, was a holy and learned man, and received Livinus and his companions with much kindness. Just at this time the Blessed Bavo of St. Peter's monastery, a man of wondrous sanctity, was called to his reward, and many miracles were daily wrought at his tomb. Livinus remained thirty days in this monastery, saying Mass daily, and praying with great devotion at the tomb of the illustrious confessor, St. Bavo. Then giving his episcopal blessing to the community, Livinus and his companions set

out to preach throughout Brabant, the good monks of St. Peter's having provided them with all necessities for the journey.

The Irish strangers greatly admired the rich and fruitful country through which they passed. It was a land, says old Boniface, flowing with milk and honey, and bright with the gladdening promise of a teeming harvest. The people, too, were a tall and handsome race of men, hardy, high-spirited, and brave in battle. But they were a half-Christian, half-pagan people, stained with many foul crimes. Their hands were red with mutual slaughter, they worried each other like dogs of the chase, and were moreover much given to perjury, pillage, and lust. Not a pleasant people to labour amongst, but they had souls to be saved, so Livinus tried hard to save them, and his efforts were to a great extent crowned with success.

He was considerably aided in his apostolic labours by two noble ladies named Berta and Crapahildis. They were two sisters, living together and possessed of considerable wealth, which they spent with generous liberality in the service of God. Crapahildis had a son called Ingelbertus, who had completely lost the sight of his eyes for thirteen years and five months. Livinus made the sign of the cross on his eyes, and the boy at once recovered his sight. This and many similar miracles, which Livinus wrought in confirmation of his preaching, soon brought crowds of converts to the faith of Christ, and the glory of God was magnified, and the practice of the Christian virtues became general throughout all Brabant.

Only a martyr's death was now wanting to crown the life and labours of Livinus, and evil men were not wanting who thirsted for his blood. They said he was a magician and a deceiver, the enemy of their gods and of their country. One day he was preaching to the people, a band of these impious men rushed upon Livinus, and scattering and maltreating his companions, cruelly beat him with cudgels. Moreover, one of them, Walbertus by name, thrusting a pincers into the Saint's mouth, pulled out his tongue, and flinging it on the ground cried out, "There is the false tongue of the deceiver."

This impious wretch, however, and sixteen of his companions,

were instantly destroyed by fire from heaven, and the tongue of the Saint was miraculously healed, so that he preached again to all the people as before.

Our Saviour now appeared to Livinus, and told him to be ready, for the struggle and the reward were at hand. Full of joy at this vision the Saint gathered together his flock, and having given them a final exhortation, he affectionately bade them all adieu, and kneeling down on the ground prayed to God for their perseverance. Then he rose up, and tenderly embracing each one of his weeping flock, he gave them his blessing and began his journey with a few companions to the place called Escha, where he intended to preach. Two brothers, ministers of Satan, Menizo and Walbertus by name, fearing that the Saint would escape them, gathered a crowd of evil associates and followed in hot pursuit. "O Father," said Foillan, "I hear the footsteps of a crowd approaching, and the clash of their arms ; " and, lo ! Menzio and Walbertus appeared at the head of their armed band. Livinus addressed them, trying to soften their rage, but in vain. Then he asked for a little time to pray, which was granted. After his prayer, being strengthened from above, he said to them : " Here I stand, a victim to be offered to my God, strike and spare not me ; only spare these poor companions of mine who have harmed you not." He then kissed the faithful three who had clung to him from youth, and fervently prayed that God Almighty might guard and protect them in the land of the stranger. Then signing that he was ready, the wicked brothers rushed upon the Saint, first cruelly beat him, and finally cut off his head ; " and it was on the day before the Ides of November that he suffered."

Meanwhile the holy matron Crapahildis, hearing what had taken place, came in great haste with her son, who wore still the white robes of his baptism, and she cried out aloud that they had foully murdered a holy and innocent man. Thereupon, the savage Walbertus rushed up and split her skull with one stroke of his axe ; he then attacked her son, and cut his body into three parts with his sword, and flung them on the highway beside the body of Livinus. The bodies of Livinus and the boy were carried away by his disciples and buried

in the same tomb, and nigh to them in a separate grave was also buried the body of the Blessed Crapahildis.

It is difficult to ascertain the exact date of the holy martyr's death. Those who identify him by Molibba, Abbot and Bishop of Glendalough, say that he was put to death on the 8th of January, 633.¹ But as Boniface expressly says that the day before the Ides of November was the day of his passion, as it is also the day of his festival, we can only regard the difference between these dates as an argument against the identity of Molibba and Livinus. Besides Livinus only came to Ghent after the death of St. Bavo, which occurred about 653. Hence Lanigan agrees with Fleury in assigning the death of Livinus to the 12th of November, 656.

Escha, where the Saint was attacked by Walbertus and his companions was quite near the village of Hauthem, three miles from Ghent. The holy remains were at first buried at Hauthem, but were afterwards translated on several occasions. In the year 842 Theodore, Bishop of Cambrai, caused the relics of Livinus and Briccius—the baptismal name of the noble boy who was slain with Livinus—to be taken up and interred in a splendid monument at Hauthem. Afterwards in the year 1200 they were transferred for greater security to the monastery of St. Bavo at Ghent. At present the sacred remains repose in the cathedral church of St. Bavo, and are greatly venerated by the people of Ghent and of all Belgium, who have the deepest devotion for the memory of St. Livinus.

“Livinus was,” says his biographer, “a man of God in manner, and dress, and demeanour. Fasting made him light and spare of limb, but his frame was well-knit, and though not tall of stature, his head was large and well-formed and covered with flaxen hair, that afterwards grew white and sparse upon his temples. His ears were large; his eyes were bright and pleasing, the eyebrows were white and thick; his wide forehead and bare temples were smooth and fair as marble. His cheeks were very thin from fasting yet red withal, and wondrous sweet and mild; his beard was white; his fingers long and thin; and his whole frame was lithe and graceful, with nothing superfluous.”

¹ *Loca Patriciana*, page 16, Geneal. Table I.

This photograph shows that the writer must have himself seen Livinus, or got his information from those who had seen and known him well. The flaxen hair and florid complexion of the Celt shows that it is true to nature.

It is almost unnecessary to say that there is no foundation for the statement that Livinus was "Bishop of Dublin," there being no such see in existence at the time. But it has been said by more than one writer that he is identical with Molibba, a nephew of St. Kevin, said to be abbot and bishop of Glendalough. So far as the name is concerned that theory would suit very well, for Livinus is the natural latinised form of Libba, and *Mo* is the usual Irish prefix of endearment—"My Libba." But the similarity of these two names is, we fear, the only argument in favour of their identity. The mother of Molibba is given in Father Shearman's genealogy from M'Firbis as Caeltigern, the sister of St. Kevin. But Caeltigern is very different from Agalmia or Agalunia,—and then who was Calomagnus? and who were the two uncles of Livinus, both archbishops—for St. Kevin was only an abbot? And Colman, the father of Molibba in the genealogy, is a very different name from Theagnius, the father of Livinus, as given in the life of Boniface.

We cannot at present pretend to give a solution of these difficulties, nor to establish satisfactorily the identity of the personages described and named by Boniface with any known characters in Irish history.

That Livinus was an accomplished scholar we have fortunately very clear proof in a poem which is still extant, and has been published in Migne's *Patrology*, volume 87. It is a poetical epistle addressed to his friend Floribert, abbot of the monastery of St. Peter at Ghent, who had requested him to compose a metrical epitaph for the tomb of St. Bavo. Both epistle and epitaph are written in elegiac metre, and in a very elegant style, far surpassing in our opinion the similar productions of most of his contemporaries. The many classical allusions very appropriately introduced by the poet, show that he was a man of wide culture, perfectly familiar with the writers of antiquity, and endowed with a refined and cultivated taste.

EARLY NATIONAL SYNODS IN IRELAND.

BENEDICT XIV., confessedly the highest authority on the subject, adopts the common division of councils or synods into four classes; that is, general or œcumenical, national, provincial, and diocesan; and he describes the national synod as that in which the archbishops and bishops of a single kingdom or nation assemble together under the presidency of a patriarch or primate.¹ "Such a national synod has sometimes," he adds, "been called universal, because it embodies the whole episcopacy of the nation;" and so early as the year 418 an African synod was called plenary in the same sense, as including a *full* representation of the *entire* African Church, or, as St. Augustine called it, "*synodus plenaria totius Africae.*" Such a synod usually includes the metropolitans and suffragans of several provinces, and hence has been called a "*synodus comprovincialis,*" which seems to imply that in its essence it is still provincial, though consisting of the episcopal representatives of many provinces.

The term "plenary" is that which is most in use at the present time, and has been officially applied to the Council of Maynooth, of Westminster, and of Baltimore. The term "national," when applied to synods or churches, is not viewed with much favour in Rome. It seems to imply a distinct national or primatial jurisdiction, which hardly exists any longer in the strict sense of the term; and it is, moreover, apt to beget the idea of individuality and distinction rather than of absolute unity and conformity. National peculiarities will, no doubt, always exist in the Church; but the policy of its chief rulers has always been to promote, as far as possible, unity of government, of ritual, and of discipline throughout the world.

¹ Strictly speaking, there is no "primacy" where there are no subordinate metropolitans. There may, however, be an archbishop who has no suffragans; but he cannot be regarded as a metropolitan, except, perhaps, *in posse*.

The subjection of national and provincial synods to the supreme authority of the Pope has been recognised from the beginning of the Church's history. It is not necessary to prove here that such subjection is involved in the very idea of the primacy of the Pope; for, if he is the Supreme Pastor and Doctor of the Universal Church, his jurisdiction extends to the laws and customs regulating the holding of synods, which are the living expression of the manifold spiritual energy of the Church. If these synods are not *de jure divino* in the strict and formal sense of the word, they are certainly *secundum jus divinum*; they are the natural and necessary outcome of the divine constitution of the Church; and the vigilance of the Supreme Pastor is nowhere more necessary than in promoting, regulating, and reviewing the action of these assemblies, which exercise so powerful an influence over the whole spiritual life both of the clergy and of the people.

The right of the Pope, therefore, to intervene directly, or by his legates, in the convocation and celebration of plenary and provincial synods, so far as he deems it necessary or useful, cannot be questioned. Of course, the legislation of the Church regulating this intervention has varied at different periods. Certain general principles, however, have been always recognised and acted upon, although the specific legislation has varied at different times. Thus the principle that "*Causae Majores*" were reserved to the Holy See has always been admitted, although there has been great diversity of practice in determining what the *Causae Majores* were. Another principle universally recognised was the right of appeal to the Pope from the judgment of any plenary or provincial synod, and such appeals have been made from the beginning of the Church's history. A third law, of strict and universal obligation, at least since the Bull of Sixtus V., requires that the decrees of all provincial synods shall, before publication, be transmitted to Rome, to be reviewed by the Holy See. If published without the review and sanction of the Holy See, they are altogether null and void, and have no force, even as diocesan laws.

Our present purpose is to show that the most important

of these general principles were recognised and acted upon in our Irish Church from the very beginning, although for many ages Ireland might fairly be described, with reference to Rome, as one of the most remote countries in the world, situated, as Patrick himself describes it, "at the very ends of the earth." No doubt, the documents connected with the earliest period of the history of our Irish Church are very meagre; still, quite enough remains to show that in all its main features its discipline was identical with the discipline of the fifth century, throughout all the churches of the West. The very keenness of the disputes about the form of the tonsure and the Paschal question only places the general uniformity of discipline in a clearer light.

The anxiety of our national apostle, though "placed at the ends of the earth," to keep in touch with Rome, is strikingly illustrated by one incident in his history, which deserves more attention than it has actually received.

Under date of A.D. 441, the Annals of Ulster state:—"Leo ordained 42nd Bishop of the Church of Rome; and Patrick the Bishop was approved in the Catholic faith." This entry has puzzled Protestant writers; but its meaning is very clear to those acquainted with Catholic discipline.

Pope Leo the Great was consecrated on September 22, A.D. 440; but news of his elevation to the papal throne could scarcely reach Ireland before the beginning of the next year. Patrick was at that time preaching in the West of Ireland; and he was keeping the Lent on the summit of Croaghpatrick, in the County Mayo, when the news of the elevation of the new Pope reached him. He at once despatched, from Cruachan Aigle, Munis (his nephew), "with counsel unto the Abbot of Rome, and relics were given to him there."¹ That is, he sent Munis to Rome to pay homage in his name to the new Pope, to give an account of his Irish mission, to ask the Pontiff's counsel in his difficulties, and to beg a supply of relics for the consecration of the new churches which he was every day founding. We know, too, that Munis soon returned from Rome, crossing the Shannon at Clonmacnoise, with his case

¹ *Rolls Tripartite*, vol. i., p. 84.

of relics ; ¹ that he brought the Pontiff's blessing to Patrick, confirming the commission which he had received from Celestine and his successor, to convert the "Scottish" tribes to the faith of Christ. This is what the annalist means when he tells us that in A.D. 441, "Patrick was approved in the Catholic faith." ² There was no one to "approve" him but the new Pope, to whom Patrick had sent a special messenger to procure his approbation.

Patrick could not hold a plenary synod in our sense of the word, for there was then, and long after, no archbishop or metropolitan in the country but himself and his comarbs or successors. But he certainly held a general synod, or, if you wish, a metropolitan synod of Ireland. He could not, of course, do this until he had completed his missionary visitation of the whole country, and established his own primatial see in Armagh. This was about the year A.D. 457.³ The decrees of that synod are still extant, and, in fact, prove their own authenticity by many incidental references to paganism, to slavery, to clerics coming from Britain, to the Brehon Laws, etc. The heading is: "Incipit sinodus episcoporum, id est, Patritii, Auxilii, Issernini;" and, in accordance with Patrick's usual custom it begins with the act of thanksgiving: "Gratias agimus Deo Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto;" and is addressed: "Presbyteris, et diaconibus et omni clero Patritius, Auxilius, Isserninus salutem."

The absence of the name of Patrick's coadjutor and destined successor, Secundinus, goes to prove that this synod was not celebrated during his life, for he was the first of the Irish bishops to die, nearly ten years before.⁴ We must not, however, infer from the fact that only three names are mentioned, that there were only three bishops present. We may be sure that Patrick kept the law, and invited all the prelates who could come to be present at the

¹ *Rolls Tripartite*, vol. i., p. 85. ² *Annals of Ulster*, loco citato.

³ The *Annals of Ulster* place the founding of Armagh in A.D. 444, that is when Patrick first preached in Orich. He then founded a church on the plain of Macha, but did not found his cathedral on the height of Macha until A.D. 457—thirteen years later.

⁴ "De quo fertur quod ipse primus episcopus sub humo Hiberniae exivit"—A.D. 448.

synod, and that a large number were present. But it was not customary then, nor is it necessary even still, that all the prelates present sign their names, or that the decrees should run in the names of all. The celebrated jurist, Fagnanus, says that the decrees of a provincial synod are not attributed to the synod, but to the archbishop,¹ and that the ordinary formula is this: "Nos Metropolitanus, etc., decernimus." Patrick might have used the same form, and have merely said—"Presbyteris et diaconibus et omni clero Patritius episcopus salutem;" but he adds the names of Auxilius and Isserninus, because they were destined like himself for the Irish mission from the beginning, and had a subordinate commission from Germanus, if not from the Pope himself, to aid Patrick in preaching the Gospel to the Irish. Moreover, having been trained on the Continent, they had acquired some knowledge of the Canon Law, of which the Irish-born prelates trained by St. Patrick himself could have known little or nothing at that time.

The decrees of this synod, as published by Spellman, in 1639, from a manuscript in the Cottonian Library, are incomplete. He gives thirty-four canons according to his own enumeration, which deal entirely with domestic questions concerning the Irish Church. But the large continental Collection² of Irish canons contains a great many decrees not included in Spellman's Collection, some of which are of the highest importance as evidence of the Canon Law of the eighth century, if not all of the time of St. Patrick himself.

It is now impossible to determine where this "Synod of Patrick" was held. All the national assemblies of ancient Erin were held in some part of the Kingdom of Meath—at Uisnech, Tara, or Teltown (Tailtenn). We know also that the national synods of the twelfth century were nearly all held in Meath, and Adamnan also held his synod at Tara,

¹ See Bouix, p. 89.

² Cardinal Moran tells us that the Imperial Library of Paris has two copies of this collection, one of the twelfth, the other of the eighth century. Darmstat has one of the ninth century; St. Gall has another, ancient copy; the Vaticellian Archives of Rome have a copy of the tenth century; and the Cottonian Codex has a copy of the eighth century; and a Cambray MS. has another of the same date. See *Essays*, etc., p. 125.

even after it had ceased to be a royal residence. The presumption, therefore, is that Patrick's synod was held somewhere in Meath, probably at Teltown, for we find a reference in the *Life of St. Brigid* to a synod of clerics held at that place, the date of which would fit in very well with the time of holding this national synod. As Armagh was not founded, at least as the primatial see, before A.D. 457, and as Auxilius, who is said to have been present at the synod, died in A.D. 460, we may fix the date of the synod somewhere in A.D. 458, or 459.

We need not now refer to the canons regarding domestic discipline enacted by this synod. The most important of all was the decree establishing the primacy of Patrick's see at Armagh, over all Ireland, and formally recognising, at the same time, the right of appeal to the Pope in the *Causae Majores*. The authenticity of the canon is undoubted, for it is contained not only in the *Codex of Irish Canons*, but, also in the *Book of Armagh*; and it is quoted by Cumnian, as we shall presently see, in his Letter on the Paschal Question, written probably in A.D. 634. The words of the second part of this canon regarding the appeal to Rome are worth quoting from the text in the *Book of Armagh*.

After declaring that the "Prelate of Armagh" was to be the judge of appeal, not only in ordinary but even in more difficult causes, it is significantly added:—"Si vero in illa cathedra Archiepiscopi Hiberniensium, (id est Patricii) cum suis sapientibus causa facile sanari non potest, ad sedem Apostolicam decrevimus esse mittendam, id est, ad Petri apostoli cathedram auctoritatem Romae Urbis habentem." Rome was thus declared to be the final court of appeal for the *Causae Majores*, in accordance with the general discipline of the Church at the time, as expressly laid down in the General Council of Sardica,¹ which was held more than one hundred years before the Synod of St. Patrick. This decree is attributed in the *Book of Armagh*

¹The Synod of Sardica, held most probably in A.D. 344, formally recognises the right of appeal to Rome in its third, fourth, and fifth canons; but the exercise of the right had long before been recognised in practice, and Pope Victor, so early as the beginning of the third century, claimed the right to decide the Paschal Controversy as one of these *Causae Majores* that essentially devolved on his Supreme Tribunal.

to Auxilius, Patritius, Secundinus,¹ Benignus, two of whom in succession were coadjutors of St. Patrick, that is, Secundinus and Benignus, and would, therefore, naturally be represented as concurring in the decree; whilst Auxilius, the nephew and co-apostle of St. Patrick, would be added to give further weight to the synodical statute.

It is quite obvious, therefore, from the most ancient documents we possess, that the general practice ² of referring the *Causae Majores* to the Holy See was a fundamental principle recognised in all the legislation of the early Church of Ireland.

But this principle was not merely recognised—it was acted upon. The first “great cause” that arose in the early Church of Ireland was the famous controversy known as the Paschal Question. It is unnecessary here to explain the nature of this controversy, or describe the grave evils and angry passions which it excited even amongst the holiest men in Ireland, as well as in North and South Britain. The evil became so very grave that it was considered desirable to convene a national synod to settle, if possible, the question. But the old jealousy between North and South prevented the assembly of a plenary synod representing all the provinces of Erin. A considerable number of prelates, however, did assemble at Magh Lene, in the year 630, for the discussion of this, as well as of some other important questions; and even the North was not unrepresented, for the Comarb of Ciaran of Clonmacnoise was there, and although his monastery was on the ancient border line, his territory was commonly regarded as a part of the Kingdom of Meath.

What took place at the synod we only know from the

¹ Secundinus could hardly have been present if the synod were held in 458.

² The *Codex Can. Hibern.* gives the general decree (adopted by St. Patrick) as the canon of a Roman Synod. “Synodus Romana: si in qualibet provincia ortae fuerint questiones et inter clericos dissidentes non convenient ad maiorem sedem referantur”—that is the Apostolic See.

Cummian cites it briefly as the decree which enacted that the graver causes should be referred to Rome. “Juxta mandatum . . . ut si causae fuerint majores *juxta decretum synodicam* ad caput urbium sint referendae.” See further on for explanation.

letter of St. Cummian of Clonfert to Segienus of Hy; but that letter is one of the most important documents connected with the early Church of Ireland, and affords the most convincing proofs of the recognition of the Papal supremacy by the fathers of that Church.

Bede tells us that Pope Honorius, wrote a letter to the "Scots," that is the Irish, who, he was informed, had erred on the matter of the observance of Easter, admonishing them to conform themselves in that matter to the observance of the universal Church. This letter was probably written in A.D. 628 or 629. Its immediate consequence was the convocation of this Synod of Campus Lene, as Cummian calls it; that is, the famous plain of Magh Lene, between Tullamore and Clara, on the very border line separating Conn's Half and Mogh's Half, which was the scene of the great battle in which Mogh himself was overthrown by his victorious rival. The synod was probably held at the old church of Templekieran, south of Durrow, rather than in Durrow itself, which was a Columbian monastery, and, therefore, opposed to any change in the ancient discipline.

We cannot say who presided; but as Cummian puts the successor of Ailbe at Emly first, and as the King of Cashel lived in his diocese, we may fairly infer that he presided in the absence of the Primate, Thomian, who appears to have been adverse to changing the ancient discipline. Cummian states that the fathers of the synod at first resolved to celebrate the Easter of the coming year (631), in accordance with the practice of the universal Church as the Pope had admonished them, for "our predecessors, as we know from the testimony of competent witnesses, some of whom are still living, but others resting in peace, had commanded us to accept without scruple, and in humility the wise decisions brought to us from the fountain of our baptism and learning, and the successors of the Apostles of the Lord"; or, in other words, the Popes. It is important to note how the fathers of the synod, like their fathers before them, recognised Rome, as "the fountain of their baptism and learning (*sapientiae*)," and "the source from which they were to derive sound doctrine (*meliora et potiora*)."¹ But before leaving, although

they had said the final prayer, a certain whitened wall rose up, and, pretending to adhere to the traditions of the elders, refused to accept the decision of the synod directing the celebration of the coming Easter in accordance with the practice of the universal Church.

So, as the synod was now divided on this grave question, nothing remained but to go to the place which the Lord had chosen for a final decision, in accordance with the synodic decree which directed, "Si causae fuerint majores, ad caput urbium sint referendae." Here we find Cummian, in the year A.D. 634, quoting this as a synodic decree, and a *mandatum*, as he calls it, coming down to them from their fathers; that is, the synodic decree of the Synod of St. Patrick, to which reference has been already made. This was done; "they sent to Rome, as to a mother, wise and prudent men in A.D. 631, as it seems, who returned on the third year after departure, that is 633, and told the Irish prelates how they had seen the whole world celebrating the Roman Easter together in the great church of St. Peter; they also carried back with them relics of the saints and martyrs; and we know that there was in them a divine virtue, for with our own eyes we saw a girl wholly blind opening her eyes at the touch of the relics, and also many demons driven out of the possessed."¹

When the Roman messengers returned, a second synod was, it appears, convened at Campus Albus, or Magh Ailbe near Carlow,² to receive their report. In this synod it appears that St. Laserian of Leighlin presided, because it was held in his diocese, and he was most likely one of the delegates sent to Rome. The result was that the Roman Easter was received throughout the south of Ireland, and St. Cummian, who tells us himself that he had spent a whole year studying the question, was commissioned to write a letter to the Abbot of Hy, which was the stronghold of the conservatives, setting forth the true doctrine as well as the results of the Roman mission. The letter was not

¹ See Cummian's letter in full in Migne's *Patrol.*, vol. xxxvii., p. 968.

² The Campus Albus lay on the right bank of the Barrow, and included the churches of Sletty and Leighlin (see *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick*), but some writers place it in the south of Kildare.

immediately successful in winning over the prelates of the north ; but, as we have said, it is an invaluable monument of the doctrine and the bearing of the primitive Church of Ireland. So far as we can judge it was written in A.D. 634.

But neither the synod nor the letter finally settled the Paschal controversy, which for the next sixty years was not only warmly but violently discussed both in Ireland and North Britain. We know that it led to the great conference at Whitby, in A.D. 664, and that Colman of Lindisfarne, with his Irish monks, left his see, and migrated to the stormy island of Innisboffin, off the County Mayo, rather than accept the new discipline advocated by Wilfrid at the conference of Whitby. We are told also that the rival factions went with deadly weapons to the synods, prepared, if necessary, to defend their own opinions at the sacrifice of their lives. Some of the annalists, too, attribute the terrible evils that afflicted the country, towards the close of the seventh century, to the divine vengeance for the crimes arising from the prolongation of the foolish controversy. Adamnan himself seems inclined to take the same view when he speaks of "the stupid ingratitude of those who greatly abuse God's patient mercy."¹ Indeed, Ireland, was never more grievously afflicted than during the last decade of the seventh century. There was a cow plague lasting for three years, which carried off most of the cattle, the chief wealth of the people. There was, as a natural consequence, a famine and plague of man, so that "man would eat man."² which never happened before in Ireland. The very fruit on the trees was blighted, and there was no food for man or beast. The Britons and Saxons, too, made hostile incursions on the eastern shores, committing slaughter and depredations. The very heavens were filled with portents of dread. "It rained a shower of blood in Leinster this year (693 *recte*). Butter was also turned there into lumps of gore and blood, so that it was manifest to all in general ; and a wolf was heard speaking with a human voice, which was horrible to

¹ "Valde stolidi qui ingrati Dei patientia male abutuntur."—*Life of St. Columba*, p. 184.

² *Chronicon Scotorum*, A.D. 696.

all." So the Four Masters tell us. "It is not good for the land when the clergy are divided," says an old writer, and it was amply proved then.

But a saviour was at hand in the person of the great Adamnan himself. He broke away from the stupid prejudices of his own monastery of Hy, and resolved at any cost to bring back his fellow-countrymen of the North to the discipline of the Catholic Church. For this purpose he made at least two journeys to Ireland. He came first, it seems, in 692, and spent some three or four years visiting the prelates and churches of the North, with a view to bring them to uniformity of discipline. Then he returned home to his island monastery; but he found his own monks so angry with him, that, according to some authorities, they expelled him from the island; yet he was not to be daunted. Returning to Ireland, in 697, he resolved to convene, at Tara, a great synod which would formally accept the new discipline, both as regards the Roman tonsure and the Easter question. There was no other man at the time who could succeed in gathering such an assembly as Adamnan did, for he was widely known and universally esteemed for his sanctity, his great learning, and his apostolic labours. Loinsech, the High King, at the time, belonged to his own tribe of the Cenel Conaill. The Primate, too, seems to have been his friend; and, if we can believe tradition, he wisely chose Tara as the seat of the great *Mordail*, or national assembly, which he induced the King and the Primate to convene on the royal hill, although the kings dwelt there no more. But the Rath of the Synods is still shown at Tara, and the Pavilion of Adamnan, and Adamnan's Cross, and Adamnan's Chair, and Adamnan's Mound, are still remembered in tradition, and are all shown on Petrie's map of Tara. There were present, we are told, thirty-nine ecclesiastics, over whom presided Flann Febla, the Bishop-Abbot of Armagh.¹ But he and Cennfailadh, Abbot of Bangor, seem to have been the only prelates from the North present at the

¹ The word *abb* or *abbot*, applied to a prelate at this period in our annals, does not imply that he was not also a bishop. The Pope is frequently called the Abbot of Rome, and St. Patrick himself is called Abbot of All Ireland—*Abb Erinn uile*.

synod, so strong was the feeling there in favour of the ancient discipline. But the High King was present also, and forty-seven kings of various territories ; so that, on the whole, it was a very imposing assembly. Amongst others present was the famous Muirchu Maccu Machtheni, the author of the Life of St. Patrick in the *Book of Armagh*. Reeves says that the acts of this synod were transcribed from the *Book of Raphoe* by Michael O'Clery, and are still preserved in one of the Irish manuscripts in the Burgundian Library at Brussels. Perhaps they are now in Dublin ; but we have not seen them. The leading decrees of the synod, however, are referred to by various writers.

1. First of all, the synod accepted the Roman discipline as regards the tonsure and the Paschal question, which was the primary object of Adamnan. On this point Bede says, though not expressly referring to the synod, that " Pene omnes, qui ab Hiensium dominio erant liberi, ab errore avito correctos ad unitatem reduxit (Adamnanus) Catholicam, et legitimum paschae tempus observare perdocuit." So that now all Ireland, except a few still under the influence of Hy, returned to Catholic unity of discipline.

2. He induced the assembly, which, as we have seen, was a mixed one, to sanction and promulgate the " Law of the Innocents " as it is called ; that is, a law forbidding women to take any part in the bloody battles of the time, and also strictly forbidding the killing of either women or children as non-combatants in battle. And it would appear that this law was to be enforced not only by the temporal authority, but also by the spiritual authorities under penalty of excommunication.

This was, undoubtedly, a great social reform, which even St. Patrick was not able to carry out in his own time, so fiercely vindictive were the passions of the rival tribes in Erin, as the history of all that period clearly shows.

3. A third enactment, according to some authorities made at this synod, is called the *Cain Adamnain*, or Canon of Adamnan ; about which, however, there is much difference of opinion. Some say, like Reeves, that it can hardly be the *Lex Innocentium* itself, but rather appears to have been

a fixed tax which the prelates and chiefs freely imposed upon themselves and their people in favour of the monastery of Hy; and, doubtless, also in recognition of the signal services which Adamnan had rendered to the country by his untiring efforts in the cause of Catholic unity. We cannot now discuss the question further, merely observing that this seems to be the most probable explanation of the term. The visitation dues of the Primate were also called the *Lex Patricii*—Patrick's tax. It would appear, too, that a large number of disciplinary decrees, doubtless drawn up by Adamnan from various sources, were formally adopted by this great synod, and became thenceforward what we may call the common law of the Irish Church. In the Collection of Irish Canons, which was certainly published very shortly after this synod, we find constant reference to the decrees of "the synod" without any further qualification. The learned Cardinal Moran thinks that "the synod" here referred to is this great Synod of Tara; and we think a careful examination of the decrees in the Collection will go far to confirm the justice of this view.

Examining this Irish Collection, we find four different kinds of heading made use of by the compilers, who keep them carefully distinct.

1. We find a very considerable number with the mere heading "Patricius:—" before the decree; or "Patricius dicit;" or "Patricius ait."

2. Then we have a second class of decrees quoted with the heading: "Synodus Hibernensis;" or "Synodus Hibernensis ait;" or "Synodus Hibernensis decrevit."

3. Then there is a third and numerous class of the decrees which bear the heading: "Synodus:—" or "Synodus ait;" or "Synodus dicit;" or "Synodus decrevit;" and those headings are oftentimes clearly contrasted with those of class 2, so as to show that the references are to different synods.

4. Lastly, there are a number of the decrees not derived from Irish, but from foreign authorities; and in these classes the headings expressly declare the sources from which they are taken. Thus we have "Gildas ait," "Synodus

Cartaginiensis ait," "Romani statuunt," "Synodus Agathensis," etc.

Now, it appears quite clear that the decrees of the first class which bear the name of St. Patrick are decrees of the Synod of Patrick, Auxilius, and Isserninus, to which we have already referred, and are properly and canonically attributed to Patrick, the metropolitan and president of that synod.

We think it highly probable that the second class, which are manifestly of a later date, and are attributed to the "Synodus Hibernensis," are the decrees of the Council Magh Ailbe, or the Campus Ailbe, in the County Carlow. For the Synod of Campus Lene, held three years before, was broken up in a hurry; and it is unlikely that the fathers, failing to agree on the Paschal question, would take that opportunity of drawing up a disciplinary code. Whereas, after the return of the Roman delegates, who were, doubtless, commissioned to convene a synod, nothing would be more likely than that the assembled fathers, having accepted the Roman discipline, would also draw up with their wide knowledge and experience a disciplinary code to meet the wants of the Irish Church. So it came to be known, both at home and abroad, as the "Synodus Hibernensis" by excellence.

The third class of the decrees, which are attributed to the "Synod" simply, appear to belong to the great collection sanctioned and published by Adamnan and the Primate in the great Synod of Tara.¹ It seems highly probable that the great Irish Collection of Canon Law, afterwards carried to the Continent and frequently copied there, was compiled at, or shortly after, this great Synod of Tara; and the compilers, whilst carefully separating the decrees of "Patrick" and of the "Irish Synod" would naturally quote their own new decrees as those of "the synod" which had just been celebrated, and was well known to them all.

¹ Several disciplinary decrees are given in the extracts from the *Codex Can. Hibern.*, published by Martene, as "Canones Adamnani." They refer mostly to abstinence "from blood and from things strangled." It is highly probable that the *Codex* was first compiled at Iona by Adamnan after the Synod of Tara; then, perhaps, somewhat enlarged there, and carried thence to the Continent by monks of Iona, who fled from the bloody raids of the Danes.

IRELAND AND ROME.¹

I daresay the reason why His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster has asked me to propose this resolution is the fact that I am an Irish Prelate, and, as everyone knows, Irish Catholics all over the world are conspicuous for their loyalty and devotion to the Holy See. It is, however, for me a labour of love to propose the resolution before this most distinguished assembly. My whole heart goes with it ; I should like to see it written in letters of gold, fit to present to the Holy Father ; and if I fail to do justice, it is not from want of any goodwill, but rather of adequate thought and speech to do full justice to the lofty theme. Newman has said in one of his beautiful lectures that the obligations which we owe to the Holy See are of a twofold character—obligations of duty and obligations of gratitude. The distinction is a just one. Our obligations of duty to the Holy See are imposed on us by the divine law ; they are definite in their nature, and cannot be transgressed without sin. Our obligations of gratitude are more human in their character, more indefinite and more intangible, but not the less real, because they are the outcome not so much of positive law, as of the promptings of grateful, loving hearts, softened by human sympathy and elevated by divine grace.

Worldly-minded men outside the Church cannot understand the intense and affectionate devotion which all true Catholics cherish for our Holy Father the Pope. They can understand, and they do cherish justly, devoted loyalty to his Majesty the King ; but the Pope—is he not, they say, a foreign Prelate living in Rome, and why should freeborn Englishmen look upon him as little less than a god ? Well, we do not look

¹ Speech in the Albert Hall, London, on the 12th September, 1908, in connection with the Nineteenth International Eucharistic Congress in moving the second resolution which was as follows :—

"The Nineteenth International Eucharistic Congress proclaims the unalterable fidelity of all its members to the Apostolic See and their desire to conform themselves in all things to the instructions of the Holy Father."

upon the Pope as a kind of god, nor do we believe him exempt from the frailties and imperfections of our human nature. But we believe, and we know, that he is the Vicar of Christ, and that his dignity is, therefore, the highest on earth. We know from the unerring words of Christ Himself that Peter, who lives for ever in his successors, has been invested with many high prerogatives clearly set out in the Gospel ; that he is the supreme ruler and legislator of the Church of God ; that he has the keys of the kingdom of heaven ; that what he binds on earth is bound also in heaven. We know that he is the infallible teacher of the universal Church, which he cannot lead astray ; that he is its rock foundation, the source of its strength, and the centre of its unity. We know that he is the inflexible guardian of the moral law, the faithful custodian and fearless exponent of the whole Truth of God ; that he has always warred against oppression and injustice, and that neither kings nor parliaments, nor peoples, though they have often tried, can ever silence his voice or paralyse his power. He is the Ruler of the City set upon the Rock that can never be overthrown, " for its builder and maker is God." The Chair in which he sits was not fashioned by human hands ; the prerogatives with which he is invested were not given to him by human or popular vote, but by Him to Whom all power in heaven and on earth belongs. Other kingdoms and empires rise, flourish and pass away, like all human things, but his throne endures for ever, and his sceptre no human power can break. He may be robbed as his predecessors were often robbed before, but we love him even more in his poverty than in his riches ; he may be imprisoned, but his voice will reach us through his prison bars, and be heard and obeyed by faithful hearts ; he may be even put to death by wicked men like so many of the early Popes, but his martyrdom will be a new strength to his throne and a new triumph for his children. Look back upon the past and you will see all these statements proved by the facts of history, and all these prerogatives of the Popes at all times active in beneficent operation.

I cannot stay to give examples from the general history of the Church, but I will briefly point to some few things which

the Popes have done for these kingdoms. "Go teach ye all nations"—it was a far cry from Rome to the Isles of Britain in those days, and a dangerous journey; but they came, those teachers commissioned by the Popes, and God visibly blessed their work. If we accept the testimony of Bede, the first British churches in these islands were founded by missionaries from Rome sent by the Pope at the request of a British king. Certain it is that St. Ninian studied at Rome, and came by the authority of the Pope, bringing the doctrine and discipline of Rome to the infant church of Candida Casa, which thus became the cradle of British christianity in the North. Certain it is that it was Pope St. Celestine who sent at first Palladius, and, when he failed, St. Patrick, to preach the Gospel in Ireland; and certain it is, too, that from the summit of Croagh Patrick in the far west of Ireland that same Patrick sent in the Lent of 441 his own nephew, Munis, "with counsel for the Abbot of Rome," that is to congratulate Leo the Great on his accession to the papal throne; to give an account of, and beg the confirmation and blessing of the Pope on the work of his mission in Ireland. And the *Annals of Ulster*, the most authentic of our annals, tells that this confirmation and blessing he received from the Pope the following year, and by the same messenger. And surely everyone knows that it was St. Gregory the Great who sent Augustine and his companions to convert the Saxons and the Angles, and thereby became the prime founder of the See of Canterbury, and of the Anglo-Saxon Church.

We hear the Catholic Church in England sometimes sneered at as an Italian mission. Well, the Christian Church in England was from the beginning an Italian, or rather a Roman, mission, and whatever Christianity the people possess they got through that mission. The subsequent negations and corruptions are their own, but it is undeniable that their positive Christianity, such as it is, they owe to a Roman mission. They may sneer at it now, but it reminds one of a shameless child sneering at the parents that gave it birth. The Christianity of England was planted by the Popes, and watered by the Popes, and under their protection grew up to be a stately tree laden with the golden fruit of manifold good

works, until its spreading branches were rudely broken on account of the incredulity of its own children. "*Tu fides stas*"—we stand by faith rooted in the Rock. It was not the fault of the people but of their rulers. The tyranny of a licentious king and servile parliament like a storm swept over the land, and that fair and fruitful tree was torn from its roots and laid prostrate on the earth. I have said that the Pope is the inflexible guardian of the moral law. Well he proved it then, for, though he knew he risked the loss of a kingdom to the Church, he refused to grant the king the dispensation forbidden alike by the laws of God and man. So it was in England, but not so in Ireland. We, too, had to deal with their Henrys and Cranmers and Elizabeths; but we had the teaching of St. Patrick to guide us: "Before all things be loyal to Rome"—"*Ut Christiani ita et Romani sitis.*" That principle had sunk deep into the hearts of our fathers, and had become to them and to us a second nature. And so it came to pass that when the same storm burst upon Ireland, though it blew long and furious, and left all the branches bare, the tree of Ireland's faith, rooted in the Rock, withstood the storm, and once more burst into bloom when the wild fury of the blast had passed away. St. Patrick's teaching and his prayers and tears on the Holy Mountain for the perseverance of his children in the faith had prevailed against all the strength of the storm—yet not these alone without Rome, for during all the dreadful time the Irish people were strengthened and sustained by the exhortations and counsels and material resources furnished by the Popes. It was the "wine from the Royal Pope," so often borne across the seas that proved to be for the afflicted people of Ireland a cordial of spiritual strength and vitality, which kept life in their breaking hearts.

Then, again, we owe an undying debt of gratitude to the Popes for all that they have done for Christian Education, and especially for Higher Education, in these kingdoms. No country has up to the present been more unfortunate than Ireland in the matter of University education. Our ancient schools were very famous, but were destroyed by foreign invasions, and although the Popes, on three different occasions, sought to establish a University in Ireland, their

efforts failed, owing to internal dissensions and religious persecutions. It is to the Popes that Scotland owes her ancient and famous University, and both Oxford and Cambridge were founded not by kings and Parliaments, but by great Catholic prelates, with the sanction and blessing of the Holy See, who not only founded, but endowed them with royal munificence. And this is true, not only of England and Scotland, but, to some extent, of every country in Europe, for they all owe their ancient and famous Universities to the fostering care of the Popes, and of great Catholic Prelates under the guidance and encouragement of the Popes. Yes, the Popes were ever the munificent patrons of learning, and of learned men, the arbitrators among warring princes, and the great moral force that civilized barbarian Europe. And, in later days, is it not to the saintly Pius IX. that you owe the restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in England, and all the Catholic Schools and Colleges, which are the outcome of that restoration? He it was who sent a truly great man, Cardinal Wiseman, from his own city, with plenary authority to build up from the scattered stones of the ancient sanctuaries of this land a new spiritual edifice, of which your noble Cathedral is the outward and visible expression. And was it not our present Holy Father, Pius X., who authorised his Grace the Archbishop, the worthy successor of Wiseman and Manning, to gather here, in this city of London, the imposing and most representative Eucharistic Conference that we have yet seen assembled in Europe?

And can there be any more striking and significant Act of Faith than the proceedings of this International Eucharistic Congress in this city of London, here, where it was treason to proclaim the supremacy of the Pope, and where the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was, and is still, declared to be idolatry—here, where More and Fisher and Plunkett, and hundreds of others, laid down their lives for the Pope and for the Mass? And this is only one of the strong claims that the present illustrious occupant of St. Peter's Chair has on our affectionate loyalty and devotion. During the five or six years of his Pontificate he has done many great things for God and His Church. "To restore all things, in Christ" is his lofty purpose,

and, surely, he has already done much to accomplish it. He has been frequently assailed, and threatened, and calumniated ; but, immovable as the rock on which the billows dash themselves in vain, with fixed purpose and steadfast courage he confronts all the enemies of the Church, and has already conquered them. Not Leo, when he faced Attila, not Hildebrand, when he confronted the German Emperor, not Pius VII., when, with calm courage, he defied Napoleon, fronted the foe with more resolute and unbending fortitude than that with which Pius X. resisted and conquered the godless government of France, even when his heart was breaking for the starving priesthood of that hapless nation. We love and admire our Holy Father for many things—for the beautiful simplicity of his character, for his pastoral virtues,—his zeal, his charity, his patience, his humility, but more than all we love and admire him for his steadfast unyielding courage in fighting the battle of the Church in France. Before all, we—the children of poor, persecuted Ireland—admire him, we, whose whole lives, from the cradle to the grave, have been one long struggle for the faith ; we, who would live and die in poverty rather than tolerate any tampering with our religion or our religious education ; we, who have spurned the proposed endowments of every kind whenever there was a shadow of a suspicion that they were intended as bribes to weaken our faith, or to fetter our religious freedom—we, before all others, love and reverence our Holy Father for the noble stand he has made to secure the freedom of the Church of France, by breaking for ever the fetters that bound her to a godless State and Government. Yea, and for that reason, before all other, we pray for our Holy Father day and night, that God may lengthen his days and strengthen his arm, until he sees the emancipated Church of France once more grow fair and strong with the coming years ; it may be in apostolic poverty, but it will also be in apostolic virtue.

We, too, in these kindoms, had our days of repression and tribulation, but, thanks to God, we have at length won the victory of patient endurance. All these are things of the past, and we are now the free citizens of a great empire, and though

we get no favours from the State, either in privilege or endowment, we have what we value far more, perfect freedom of action and absolute equality before the law. This very assembly in this great city, gathered together in connection with our Eucharistic Congress, the reception everywhere accorded to the members of the Congress, the space that the proceedings occupy in the public press, the enormous crowds that attend its meetings, are adequate proof that the old evil days are gone—let us hope for ever—and that we live to-day in the light of a more generous freedom, and of a larger and kindlier appreciation. Newman tells us in the beautiful sermon called the “Second Spring,” that the days are not long past—not yet a century—since the Catholics of England were contemptuously ignored, and their Church consisted for the most part of colonies of Irishmen living in the poorest parts of this great city, with here and there a few grave individuals of high birth and noble mien who clung to the ancient faith—but they were without regular bishops, without decent churches without political or social influence—beings who seemed rather to belong to another world. Contrast that state of things with what you see to-day—with the majestic grandeur of your cathedral, the solemn pomp of its worship, the hundred mitred heads you have seen around the altars, the illustrious personages, the heads of national churches at home and abroad, clothed in the sacred robes of Rome, the crowds of clergy and laity of high and low degree who fill this spacious hall, and one may well say that it is not merely a Second Spring, but a resurrection from the dead. Yet the Catholic Church in England was never really dead. She was overthrown and prostrate, but the principle of life was still within her. If she were like other Churches, a mere human institution, and was struck down as she has been struck down, she could never rise again. But she was not a mere human institution. She had within her even in the worst days the divine principle of life and living unity which bound her to Rome, so when the furious tempest had passed away, she felt the quickening influence of that living unity. She began once more to raise her head, slowly and painfully, but gathering strength by degrees, she grew in vigour, until at length she stood upon her feet, like a

patient recovered from a deadly fever, weak indeed but wearing the ancient lineaments of stateliness and beauty—a marvel to all who beheld her and had thought that she was dead. It was not a new tree, but a new shoot from the old stem, growing from the old roots and vitalised by the same sap.

Yes, thanks to God and to the Vicar of Christ, the sight we see to-day is a glory and a wonder—not a thing to make us proud, but full of thanksgiving. “*Non nobis, Domine, non nobis.*” Thine be the praise and the glory ; be it ours to be humble and thankful. No such ecclesiastical assembly has been seen in England since the Reformation, no, nor before the Reformation. England never saw an assembly graced by so many princes of the Church, from so many countries of Europe, with a Cardinal Legate representing the Pope at their head. Of old they might have had more civic pomp and secular power around them. We have what is better still—a great gathering of the highest prelates in Europe and America, drawn together by the bonds of faith and love, at the invitation of the successor of St. Augustine, and under the presidency of the Legate of that See which sent Augustine to found the Church of England. Here there is unity and catholicity and continuity, which binds together the near and the distant, the present and the past. It is not an aggregate of discordant units, but a homogeneous gathering of prelates obedient to one rule, animated by one faith, inspired by one purpose—to honour our Saviour in the Sacrament of the Blessed Eucharist, and next to that to add the testimony of their homage and devotion to our Holy Father the Pope. Besides the prelates and clergy of England under his Grace the Archbishop, we have here to-day the Cardinal Primate of Ireland, the heir of St. Patrick, to testify to the unity in faith and charity of the Catholics of England and Ireland. We have the eloquent Cardinal Primate of the United States, with many prelates and priests from that great and growing Church. We have the learned Archbishop of Melbourne—a native like myself, of the West of Ireland—and some of his colleagues from the young Church of Australia. We have the Cardinal Primate of Belgium, not only the head of the Belgian Church, but a most distinguished scholar of his own great

University of Louvain, and who himself rendered signal service to the cause of University Education in Ireland by his luminous evidence given in this city before the Robertson Commission. We have also the Cardinal Primate of Toledo, the successor of the illustrious Ximenes, the glory of the Spanish Church. We have also, I am told, French prelates, whom we gladly welcome here in this time of their trial, as they often welcomed our countrymen from England and Ireland, to whom they gave hospitality and education when they dare not have it at home. I believe we have here to-day clergymen and laymen from every country in Europe, as well as from the whole Western world, assembled for the same purpose, and animated by the same Catholic spirit of love for the Blessed Eucharist and loyalty to our Holy Father the Pope, in which they are joined by thousands of the laity of all classes, from the illustrious head of England's nobility down to the poorest of the poor.

And with one heart and with one voice we will ask you, my Lord Cardinal Legate, to bear to our Holy Father this loving message of loyal devotion to his person and his See. We ask your Eminence to tell in our name that we thank him for his splendid services to the Church, that we deeply sympathise with him in his trials and afflictions, and that we shall always pray God to sweeten the cup of his sorrows and lighten the burden of his labours and anxieties. Tell him how we admire his lofty purpose, so faithfully carried out, of "restoring all things in Christ." Tell him we are grateful for his vigorous and authoritative condemnation of the recent errors of Modernism, which are utterly subversive of Christianity. Tell him that we are specially grateful for his Encyclical on Frequent Communion, and on the duty of giving catechetical instruction to our flocks, both of which have already produced much fruit, and also for the latest Jubilee Exhortation to the clergy all over the world. Tell him, above all, how we love and admire him for his unflinching courage in vindicating the liberty of the great Church of France, and spurning the proffered doles of its godless-Government, which were only to be purchased at the price of a new enslavement. Moreover, we ask your Eminence to tell

our Holy Father what you have seen and heard in this city of London during the progress of this Congress. We think you may tell him that you have seen here no sign of wavering faith or timorous loyalty towards the Holy See, that heart and soul, beyond the mountains as within the mountains, we are its devoted children ; that in this the new Churches and the old Churches, the Churches beyond the ocean, and the ancient Churches of Patrick, Columba, and Augustine, are animated by the same spirit and inspired by the same devotion to the See of St. Peter ; and you can truly tell him also that we are to-day as ready to fight, and, if necessary, to die for our Lord in the Blessed Eucharist, and for the Primacy of the Pope, as our fathers were in the past, so many of whom suffered and died in that great cause ; and you may add that we promise faithfully to put in practice the instructions contained in his beautiful Encyclical on Frequent Communion. Tell his Holiness also that we shall never cease to pray for him, and that with yearning hearts on bended knees we implore his Apostolic Blessing for ourselves and for our flocks, for our families and our friends, that we may be united hereafter, in Heaven, as we are all united here to-day, in love and devotion to the Blessed Eucharist and loyalty to the Holy See.

THE HOLY HOUSE OF LORETO.¹

At the request of an esteemed correspondent we give a brief narrative of the translations of the Holy House of Loreto. We cannot, however, afford space for a critical examination of the subject; the story must speak for itself.

It is well known that the Blessed Virgin was espoused to St. Joseph in Nazareth; there, too, the Annunciation and Incarnation were accomplished; and there the Holy Family lived for many years after their return from Egypt. It was, as might be expected from their poverty and simplicity, a plain abode, consisting of two apartments which, tradition tells us, adjoined a grotto excavated in the face of the rocky hill on whose brow the little city then stood. This grotto still remains, but every trace of the house has disappeared. It has not, however, been covered by the dust of ages like a common ruin. As we shall see, it was miraculously transferred from the East to the West, from the El Nasirah of the infidel to the younger city by the Adriatic Sea, which Christian piety and faith have raised and embellished in honour of the Holy Shrine.

We may very reasonably assume that the abode of the Holy Family was, even in the first ages of the Church, a place of special reverence and devotion. No Christian could view with feelings of indifference the scene of the most sacred and fundamental mystery of the religion which he professed. The Holy House would thus be guarded from profane intrusion, and become an object of special care and veneration to the faithful in its neighbourhood. However about the year A.D. 71 it seems that Nazareth, like most other of the towns in Judea, suffered much from the devasta-

¹ This paper appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for January, 1882.

tions of the victorious Romans. But the Holy House providentially escaped the ruin and pillage which, as St. Jerome tells us, reduced Nazareth to a half desolated hamlet; for we find that when peace was restored to the Church it became a shrine which was yearly visited by crowds of pilgrims. St. Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, caused a spacious and splendid church to be built round the Holy House, both for the accommodation of the pilgrims, and the more efficient and becoming protection of the Holy Shrine. Over its portals were inscribed these words: "This is the sanctuary wherein were laid the first foundations of our redemption." This church of St. Helena was for many centuries daily crowded with a pilgrim host and it is manifest that no profane hand could then dare to touch the smallest stone of the holy walls. We find SS. Paula and Eustochium, the spiritual daughters of St. Jerome, making a pilgrimage to the shrine towards the end of the fourth century. Later on we hear of St. John Damascene and St. John Calybites as pilgrims at the Holy Shrine of Nazareth; in the twelfth century Tancred with many of his companions in arms went in palmer's guise to the house of the Blessed Mary; in the thirteenth century three illustrious pilgrims went thither from the far West, St. Francis of Assisi, Sigefroy, Archbishop of Mayence, and Cardinal James de Vitry, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and author of the *Historia Orientalis*, the most valuable mediæval work on Eastern history. The testimony of Cardinal de Vitry about the Holy House is especially valuable. He tells us that on the Feast of the Annunciation in 1228, "he celebrated the Holy Mysteries in the very abode where Mary was saluted by the Angel." In 1252, on the same day, the 25th March, the Feast of the Annunciation, the good king Louis of France, "received communion in the sacred chamber of the Mother of God."

These express testimonies leave no doubt that in the thirteenth century the Holy House was still to be seen at Nazareth, in the Church of St. Helena, and therefore outweigh any arguments derived from the silence of other writers, who might be expected to make explicit mention

of the fact. Positive testimony on one side must disprove any merely negative evidence on the other.

In the spring of 1291, Tripoli and Ptolemais were taken by the Saracens, who had previously defeated the Christians in many fierce encounters and overrun the country even to Nazareth, where they partly destroyed the Church of St. Helena. The Holy House within, however, was still spared, but there could be no doubt that now the fanatical Moslem, having conquered the last strongholds of the Christians, would make short work of the sacred shrine, had not Providence signally interfered.

Ptolemais and Tripoli were captured in 1291—the former in the month of April. The victorious Moslems thereupon began to overrun the country with fire and sword, making special efforts to destroy everything venerated by Christians. They were already on their way to Nazareth, when suddenly the Holy House entirely disappeared, leaving only the traces of its foundations behind. This was in May 1291, on the 9th or 10th day of the month. At the very same time, on the morning of the 10th of May, a new and very strange house was for the first time seen at a place called Tersatz or Tersatto, near Fiume, in Dalmatia. The old castle of Tersatto is situated in what is now the Austrian crownland of Croatia, but the place is the same. The strange sight drew curious passers-by to the spot; they had never seen a house there before, and they were still more astonished when, on nearer approach, they observed the apparently old edifice resting on the uneven soil, and built of a curious brick-coloured stone, of which they had not seen the like anywhere in the neighbourhood. On entering, they were lost in wonder to see an altar, a rude statue of the Virgin and Child, a crucifix, and several sacred emblems in various parts of the House. What could it be? Where did it come from? No one could tell. But no human hand had built it there. So old and yet so new: it was clearly a holy place, a miraculous thing, but more they knew not.

Their doubts however were soon set at rest. The news had spread abroad, and reached the Bishop of Tersatto, who was then dangerously ill. His name was Alexander;

he was very anxious to see the miraculous house, but he was unable to travel. That same night, however, the Blessed Virgin appeared to Alexander, and declared that the strange house was the very building in which she was born, where the Incarnation was accomplished, and where she had lived so long with St. Joseph and her divine Son. As a sign he was immediately cured, and came to the Holy House, and told the wondering crowds that it was indeed the abode of Mary and of her Son. The crowds increased, miracles were multiplied; the news even reached the camp of the Emperor Rudolph I., where Nicholas Frangipani, Lord of Tersatto, and Governor of Dalmatia, then was serving in the camp of the Emperor. He asked permission to return, and investigate the story for himself. The leave was readily granted, and Frangipani, to his amazement, found the reality even more wondrous than the relation.

He resolved, however, to act with prudence. So he sent four Commissioners, of whom Alexander the Bishop was one, all the way to Nazareth, to compare the facts, and make further inquiries. Accordingly the Commissioners, before their departure, took exact measurements of the length, breadth, and height of the house, and the thickness of the walls; they observed the style of the building and the nature of the material. All was found to be as they expected. The foundations of the Holy House, its empty place, were there in Nazareth, but the building itself was gone—quite recently gone, as the inhabitants themselves admitted. The walls were of the same dimensions, the material was the same—the reddish sandstone, fine in texture, and striped with yellow veins, which they had noticed in the house at Tersatto, and now saw strewn about in the streets and quarries of Nazareth. When they returned home, and gave a detailed account of their observations, no one could any longer doubt that the vision of their Bishop was indeed from the Blessed Virgin, or that the Holy House of Nazareth was now resting on the summit of that hill which overlooks the green islands of the Adriatic, where the foaming Fiumara still thunders down its rocky bed, through the deep ravine of the Porta Hungarica.

But the Holy House did not long remain in Dalmatia.

It disappeared quite as suddenly as it came, after a period of some three years and a half. The people were filled with grief for the loss of the Holy House ; they feared it was a chastisement for their sins or irreverence towards the Shrine ; and so the governor and citizens in memory of the vanished treasure built upon the spot a new house of exactly the same style and shape and size. But an inscription in the wall expressly declared that the abode of Mary had disappeared from amongst them, and that this was only a memorial chapel. On the road leading to the church there was also raised another inscription which mentioned the exact dates : " The Holy House of the Blessed Virgin Mary, came to Tersatz on the 10th of May, 1291, and departed on the 12th December, 1294." A column marks the spot even to the present day, for the chapel has disappeared ; and so early as the fifteenth century the inhabitants of Tersatto, who used to come to Loreto every year in crowds, founded there the Confraternity of the Corpus Domini or Perpetual Adoration, which was confirmed by Sixtus IV. in 1464.

On its disappearance from Tersatto the Holy House was borne in the hands of Angels across the Adriatic, and was first seen on the 10th of December, 1294, in a laurel grove about three miles from the sea, in the Marches of Ancona. As at the Nativity, the wondrous sight was first seen by shepherds in the night time. It may be, they were watching their flocks in the wintry weather under shelter of the laurel grove, when they were attracted by a light in the lonely wood, and on nearer approach found the Holy House exactly as it was seen in Dalmatia, with the altar, crucifix, and statue of the Madonna. The shepherds at once proclaimed the wonder, and crowds came from the neighbouring town of Recanati to behold the unwonted sight. Numerous miracles were wrought at the shrine. St. Nicholas of Tolentino, and a holy hermit in the neighbourhood, had each a vision revealing to them that the Holy House of Nazareth was indeed in the grove of Laurels. The ecclesiastical authorities had hitherto taken no step, but news of the wonder was soon brought to Rome, and Boniface VIII. ordered the Bishop to take an exact relation of the alleged

miraculous occurrences, and ascertain the truth by every means in his power.

The Bishop thereupon sent a commission of sixteen of the notables of Recanati, first to Dalmatia, and afterwards to Nazareth, and ordered them to draw up an exact account of the result of their inquiries. They did so, and the report is in substance the same as that given above. This report was solemnly attested by the oaths of the members, it was preserved in the Archives of Recanati and the early historians of Loreto, Angelita, Riera, and Tursellin expressly declare that they had copies of the report in their own hands at the time of their writing.

Meanwhile, however, the Holy House had twice changed its site.

The laurel wood was remote and lonely, so brigands took advantage of the shelter of the trees to rob and otherwise maltreat unwary pilgrims, which was probably the cause why, after eight months' sojourn in the grove, it was suddenly transferred to a place quite near the highway—a small hill belonging to two brothers called Simon and Stephen Rinaldi de Antici. Here, as elsewhere, miracles were of daily occurrence, and the crowd of pilgrims increased daily, and made rich offerings to the Holy Shrine. The cupidity of the brothers was excited, they quarrelled for the possession of what was likely to be so profitable a spot, and the quarrel had well nigh ended in murder. It is not then to be wondered at that, after the short space of four months, the Holy House was again miraculously transferred, this time to the very centre of the highway then leading to Recanati, where it has remained ever since. This last translation took place towards the end of the year 1295.

In 1296 Charles II., King of Naples, wrote to a holy hermit who lived in the neighbourhood of Recanati, asking for an exact account of the wonderful translation of the Santa Casa, and of the alleged miracles which were every day reported. The hermit, in a long letter to the king, confirmed the truth of the story from what he had seen with his own eyes, and testified of his own knowledge to the reality of the miracles said to have been performed.

This letter is given in full by Martorelli, from a copy taken in 1674 by the Imperial Notary, Domenico Biscia. The original document was at that time preserved in the family archives of the Antici, to which family the two brothers already referred to had belonged.

In 1300, on the occasion of the first great centennial Jubilee in Rome, an immense crowd of pilgrims visited Loreto, and for their convenience the first buildings of what has since become a considerable city, were erected in the immediate neighbourhood of the Shrine. The name is frequently said to be derived from the laurel grove in which the Holy House first rested. It is more likely, however, that the Domus Lauretana, which gave its name to the city of Loreto, was so called from the lady Lauretta to whom the original site is said to have belonged.

A church was built round the Santa Casa by the citizens of Recanati, and great indulgences were granted in 1334 by Benedict XII. to all pilgrims visiting the Shrine.

About the middle of the fifteenth century, Paul II. laid the foundations of a new Church, much larger and more magnificent than that built by the people of Recanati. In his Bull of the 15th October, 1464, he declares that it is manifest from experience that "the Church of the Holy Mary of Loreto in the diocese of Recanati, by the innumerable and extraordinary miracles which are wrought therein at the prayer of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of which *we ourselves have had experience in our own person*, draws to that enclosure persons from all parts of the world, etc." This Church, a memorial of the Pope's gratitude and devotion to the Blessed Virgin for the miracle wrought in his own favour, was subsequently enriched and beautified both by other Popes, as well as by the crowds of grateful pilgrims who flocked thither from all parts of Europe.

Leo X. surrounded the Holy House with a casing of white marble, on which the greatest artists of the age lavished their utmost ingenuity and artistic skill. We shall notice further on some of the wonderful reliefs which adorn this structure. The Church and the Holy House were still further beautified by Clement VII., Paul III., and Sixtus V., who

caused this inscription in golden letters to be engraved on a slab of black marble in the facade of the building :—

DEIPARAE DOMUS IN QUÆ VERBUM CARO FACTUM EST,

thus leaving no doubt as to his own opinion of the reality of the translation.

Leo X. is equally explicit. In a Bull conferring large privileges and indulgences on the Santa Casa he declares “ that the Holy Virgin, as is proved by testimonies worthy of credit, having deigned by God’s good will to transfer from Nazareth her image and her house, and place them first at Fiume in Dalmatia, afterwards in the territory of Recanati, in a place covered with wood, then on a hill belonging to private persons, finally in the middle of the highway where it still stands, and where it was placed by the hands of angels ; the continual miracles worked therein by the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary have determined the Roman Pontiffs, his predecessors, to bestow on the Church of Loreto very many spiritual favours,” all of which he confirms and still further enlarges.

In 1550 a new commission of Papal chamberlains and other persons of note and credibility was sent to ascertain the tradition in Dalmatia regarding the translation of the Holy House. From Dalmatia they proceeded all the way to Nazareth, where they made an exact and detailed examination of the traditions and the locality. In both places abundant evidence was forthcoming confirmatory in every particular of the account recorded in the archives of Recanati and Tersatto. One of the commission, John of Sienna, brought from Nazareth two specimens of the native stone, which were found to correspond exactly in texture and colour with the material of the Holy House, the stone of which, as we have already noticed, though very much like brick in colour, and quite polished by contact of human hands, is in reality a reddish stone of fine texture streaked with yellowish veins, and quite different from any stone found in the neighbourhood of Recanati. De Sausure, however, the eminent French naturalist, whilst emphatically declaring that the material is stone and not brick, as many

persons have said, says that he found abundant specimens of stone of a *similar* character all around the district from Loreto to Ancona.

In 1751, when the old pavement was being removed, it was ascertained by actual experiment made in the presence of several bishops and competent architects that the walls of the Santa Casa rest on the surface soil, even the very pebbles of the old road were found beneath the walls, as well as a depth of several feet of clay, which would have been excavated for the foundations of any ordinary house. These facts were attested to the satisfaction of so keen a critic as Benedict XIV., by the Bishops of Jesi, Ascoli, Macerata, and Loreto.

The Feast of the Holy House is celebrated on the 10th December, the anniversary of its translation from Dalmatia to the Italian shore. In 1639 we find a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites permitting this Festival to be celebrated in all the Marches of Ancona. Later on, in 1669, the Translation of the Holy House was ordered to be commemorated on the same day in the Roman Martyrology.—“At Loreto in Picenum the Translation of the Holy House of the Mother of God in which the Word was made Flesh.”

Pope Innocent XII. permitted a Special Mass and Office on the Festival; in the sixth lesson of the office the history of the Translation of the Holy House is briefly recorded. In 1719 this Feast and Office were extended to Etruria, and afterwards in 1725 and 1729 to Spain, and all the territories of the most Catholic monarch.

The Holy House has been enriched with all kinds of indulgences, immunities, privileges, and treasures, to which we cannot now refer in detail. A chapter was instituted by Leo X.; Sixtus V. raised Loreto to the dignity of an Episcopal See; Julius III. founded there a college of twenty penitentiaries to confess the pilgrims in almost every European language. Benedict XIII. in 1729 made the Cathedral Church a Basilica; Pius VI. granted to it the privilege of having seven Gregorian altars; Pius VII. allowed the canons to carry the golden cross and wear the violet soutane of prelates.

The city of Loreto is now in the province of Macerata, and belongs to the kingdom of Italy. Its population is about 8,000, who may be said to depend for their existence on the influx of pilgrims. The situation of the city is very fine, on a commanding eminence, flanked by lower hills, and overlooking the unquiet waters of the Adriatic Sea. The principal street leads to the piazza, or square, in which the church of the Santa Casa is situated. One side of the square is occupied by a large house belonging to the Jesuits, on another is the splendid palace of the governor, while the church occupies the third side. In the centre is a bronze statue of Pope Sixtus V.—who fortified Loreto against the Turks—in a sitting posture, giving the benediction. Over the central door of the church is a full length statue of the Virgin and Child in finest bronze, designed by Bramante. Within the church are three superb doors of bronze divided into compartments, and adorned with reliefs representing scenes from Sacred History.

The Campanile rises to a great height, and contains in an octagonal pyramid near its summit, a bell 22,000 pounds in weight. The bronze font is considered a masterpiece.

In the very centre of the Church, under the dome, is the Santa Casa itself. The casing of pure white marble is one of the finest works of Italian art in existence. Neither time, talent, nor money, was spared in its decoration. It was designed by Bramante, and executed by Sansovino Girolamo, Lombardo, and other great artists, their disciples. Each of its four fronts is covered with Sculptures in bold relief. On the Western front is the Annunciation, which has been pronounced by a great artist to be a "divine work." On the Southern front is the Nativity; on the Eastern are depicted in relief the arrival of the Holy House of Loreto, and the Death and Burial of the Blessed Virgin. The Northern front is similarly decorated by representations of the Birth and Betrothal of the Blessed Virgin, and other sacred subjects.

This outer marble shell is a foot distant from the walls of the Santa Casa itself. The latter seems at first sight to be a small brick house, of coarse material, and rude workmanship.

There is one door facing the north, and a small window in the western side. The house itself is oblong, the greater length being from west to east, as is usual in most churches. The masonry is irregular, and the walls are not in plumb, yet the stones are fitted closely together, although not laid in regular courses. The length in the clear is about twenty-four feet, the breadth twelve, and height over fifteen feet. The walls were only fourteen inches thick.

At the foot of the eastern wall there is a small and somewhat narrow fire-place, but the chimney does not seem to have been built to the roof, so the smoke must have escaped through an opening in the top, as not unfrequently happens in the poorer class of Irish cottages. Near this fire-place is a small niche containing the statue of the Blessed Virgin and Child, which is said to have been the work of St. Luke. The statue, now almost as black as ebony, is evidently of very ancient date, and not of very artistic workmanship. In front of this eastern wall, from which it is separated only by a vacant space, there is an ancient altar on which the Apostles are said to have celebrated the Holy Sacrifice. This altar is now enclosed within a larger one, on which the pilgrim priests are allowed to say Mass. The roof of the Santa Casa is richly adorned, and has an opening for the purposes of ventilation, which is rendered necessary by the great crowd of pilgrims, as well as by the fumes of burning incense and lighted torches. The aspect of the Holy House gives further confirmation to the wondrous story of its translation; it is pre-eminently venerable with the holiness of antiquity.

The "Treasury Chapel" of the Santa Casa is adorned with some of the most beautiful frescoes in the world, and contains an immense wealth in gold, silver, pearls, diamonds, and other precious stones, altar plate, vestments, and votive offerings of every kind. In 1796, the French Republicans laid sacrilegious hands on the treasures of the Santa Casa, as they did on every thing else their greedy eyes beheld, and the French nation is still in debt to the Holy House of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It was not so in earlier days, for perhaps the richest offering in the Shrine, the crowns sparkling with precious stones; which adorn the statue of the

Virgin and Child, was the gift of Louis XIII., King of France.

Even yet the wealth in the Treasury Chapel is enormous, filling forty-one out of the sixty-nine glass cases prepared for its preservation and exhibition.

Non-Catholics, as might be expected, invariably reject the story of the translation of the Holy House as a pious fraud, or at least a superstitious fancy originating in the dark ages, and unsupported by authentic evidence. Yet they can assign no plausible explanation of its origin, and to reject the historical evidence in its favour on account of the intrinsic improbability of the story is to undermine the certainty of all historical truth. At the same time the acceptance of this history of the Holy House is no part of Catholic faith; it is not even a dogmatic fact necessarily connected with the teaching functions of the Church, on which she therefore necessarily pronounces an infallible opinion. In fact, the Church has pronounced no formal decision on the truth of the story, and consequently there is no formal obligation imposed on Catholics of accepting as an authentic fact the translation of the Holy House. Several Catholic writers have questioned the truth of the story, and subjected the proofs in its favour to sharp criticism. We may mention Calmet, whose piety and learning can hardly be called in question, although it is said he afterwards retracted his opinion.

On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that almost all Catholic writers of every school, Gallican and Ultramontane, Jesuits, Thomists, and Scotists, have accepted the evidence in favour of the translation as quite conclusive, especially when taken in connection with the numberless miracles wrought at the Shrine, as well as the sanction of the Church, and the language of the Sovereign Pontiffs. It is, therefore, no sin against faith to question the reality of the translation, but in face of the evidence adduced, and especially of the sanction given by the Church in granting a special Mass and Office for the Feast, it seems to us that it would be very rash in any individual to reject the story as intrinsically improbable, more particularly if he should do so without a careful examination of the evidence adduced

in its favour ; and this rashness would in certain circumstances become gravely culpable.

For the rest, it is not for us to say *a priori* what is a suitable miracle for God to work, and what is not suitable. The spirit that questions all miracles, even the very existence of the supernatural, will also question or reject this miracle, but the docility of faith will accept the sanction of the Church as quite sufficient reason to believe in the miraculous preservation and translation of the Holy House, and give glory to God for thus honouring the earthly habitation of His Immaculate Mother and her Divine Son.

THE HISTORY OF SLIGO, TOWN AND COUNTY.¹

ARCHDEACON O'RORKE's *History of Sligo* is a very remarkable work, and a most valuable contribution to Irish local history. Those who are acquainted with his *Ballysadare and Kilvarnet* were greatly pleased to learn that a writer so cultured and so painstaking was engaged in a history of the town and county of Sligo. They knew that the Archdeacon was master of a charming style, that the subject matter was highly interesting, that no labour would be spared in ascertaining the whole truth, and that neither candour nor eloquence would be wanting in expressing it. These expectations have been fully realized. Sligo men now possess a record of the history of their native county, of which they may feel justly proud. It is second to none, and is superior to most works of the kind. Smith's *History of Kerry* has hitherto held the first rank amongst county histories. So competent a judge as Lord Macaulay declared that he never met a better book of its kind and size. Dr. O'Rorke has very wisely followed the same plan as Dr. Smith; he has fully equalled that highly-cultured writer in the freshness and vigour of his style, and surpassed him in the extent and variety of his information. This however, is not so much to be wondered at, for an ample supply of materials for Irish history is now at the command of the student, which were practically inaccessible one hundred years ago. In another respect there is a striking resemblance between the style of the two writers. Smith was not a mere historian or antiquarian; he was a cultured classical scholar, he had a keen eye for the beauties of nature, and his language breathes the freshness of his own Killarney woods when their foliage is bathed in a summer shower. Thus we find in both writers appropriate quotations from the classics, graphic sketches of picturesque scenery, pungent allusions

¹ *The History of Sligo, Town and County.* By Archdeacon O'Rorke, D.D., M.R.I.A.

and satiric touches, which enliven the narrative, and sustain the attention of even the most drowsy reader. In this last respect Dr. O'Rourke is far superior to Smith.

But a pleasant and readable narrative of facts will not of itself make a good history. Authorities must be examined, statements must be verified, evidence must be weighed, and the net result must be summed up with the clearness and impartiality of a judicial charge. Dr. O'Rourke declares that he has spared no pains to collect and verify the facts which belong to the various aspects of his subject. This is, indeed quite evident from the formidable array of authorities to which he refers both in the text and in the notes. He takes nothing second-hand, and nothing for granted. Like every historian who is worthy of the name, he goes to the sources, trusting little to mere books of history, and even less to the mere authority of great names. This has been a work of much labour, for the author deals with the history of Sligo in its widest sense, and in all its varied aspects. He gives not merely the civil and military history of the district—its rulers, its warriors, and its battles; he gives us also the religious, the social, and, to some extent, the natural history of the County Sligo. In this last respect he is hardly so full or so interesting as Smith in the *History of Kerry*; but it must be borne in mind that Smith was a professed naturalist, and that a principal purpose of his work was to ascertain and exhibit the natural resources of the districts of which he wrote.

The town of Sligo, though now the most flourishing place in the province, is neither very ancient nor very celebrated. Reference is made to the river once or twice, but no clear reference is made to the town before the thirteenth century, for the very good reason that there was no town in it before the middle of that stirring century, when Maurice Fitzgerald, "the scorner of danger, the scourge of the Gael, and the strength of the stranger," first built the castle and convent of Sligo. But the county generally, and especially the barony of Carbury, is classic ground for the historian and antiquarian. It has pagan and Christian, military and ecclesiastical remains in abundance. Tirerrill contains the famous battle field of North Moytura, and Carbury was the scene of three of the

most celebrated conflicts recorded in Irish history—the battle of Crinder between Eoghan Beul and the men of the North in 542; the famous battle of Cuildreimhne, some twenty years later, between the Northern and Southern Hy Niall, and the battle of Creadran Cille, between Godfrey O'Donnell and Maurice Fitzgerald, in which the leaders fought like Homeric heroes, each inflicting on the other wounds that brought slow but certain death.

Dr. O'Rorke, we are sorry to see, sets small store on the alleged monuments or battles of the "prehistoric ages." He eschews legends altogether, and though he deals somewhat more tenderly with "antiquities," he will not by any means allow them to encroach on what he calls "the more recent and vital facts of his history." Ay, but what are the *vital* facts of history? Are they the names of the local gentry, and the rural clergy, and Sligo town councillors? or are they not rather those so-called legends and traditions that have been borne down to us by the great stream of time from the mystic ages of the past, that have been interwoven with the history of the nation and the nomenclature of the country, that have fed the spirit of the people in the tales of the Shanachie, and have for many an age been chanted by the bards to listening warriors in the banquet-hall and on the battle-march?

Not on bread alone does man live; and the legends and traditions are, as a rule, far more vital to the life of a nation than most proven facts and social statistics. What extant book of Livy should we take in exchange for the first? Which of her heroes exercised greater influence on the military life of Rome than he who kept the bridge, and that other whose right hand hissed in the Tuscan fire? There may be much truth in Dr. O'Rorke's statement that the traditions of the Sligo people are not trustworthy, owing to frequent disturbance of the Celtic population, and their admixture with Saxon colonists. But when Dr. O'Rorke tells us ¹ that a local conflict between the M'Donoughs and O'Conors, which was fought, as the Annalists inform us, A.D. 1398, at Magh Tuireadh, may be regarded as "the source

¹ Vol. ii., p. 268.

of all the high sounding traditions connected with the place," we venture to think he carries his scepticism too far. Why, the existing tract containing an account of the ancient battle, written by one of the O'Clerys, dates, according to O'Curry, from about the year A.D. 1460, that is while men were yet living who must have witnessed the conflict between the local dynasts on the ancient plain; still it contains not the least reference to the M'Donoughs or M'Donnells, or O'Conors, but a very full and detailed, though exaggerated account of the ancient chiefs of the Fomorians and Tuatha de Danaan, and of all their mighty deeds. The perfervid imagination of the Celtic poets and chroniclers has, no doubt, frequently added many strange and improbable incidents to these historic tales, but the substantial fact of the battle is, in our opinion, abundantly proved by the testimony of our annalists, by the tradition of the people, and above all by existing monuments on the battlefield itself. The excavations at Troy, and in the Roman Forum, and at Mycenae have done much to overthrow the credit of the hypercritical school represented by Mommsen and Niebuhr. A similar careful examination of the existing remains in Ireland will, we have no doubt, in course of time completely vindicate the substantial veracity of our native records.

The author gives us, however, a very full and most interesting account of what he would describe as the first great historic battle that took place in Carbury—that, namely, between Eoghan Beul with the Connaught men on the one side, and the Hy Niall of Tirowen and Tirconnell, under the gallant leadership of the sons of Muircheartach Mac Earca on the other. One circumstance connected with this great battle has rendered it famous, and also given rise to some antiquarian speculation. The Connaught King, according to the annalists, was slain in this battle, and his army defeated. Moreover, the victors carried away with them over the plain of Magherow the head of the slain King, and the Sligo river was choked with the corpses, and red with the blood of the slain. There is, however, a different version given in the *Life of St. Ceallach*, who was son and successor of the slain king. According to this version the king was not

slain, but mortally wounded, his army kept the field, and the dying warrior ordered his body to be buried upright in his grave with his red javelin in his hand, facing the north, and on the side of the hill by which the routed Northerns fled before the army of Connaught. Whilst the dead warrior remained thus facing the foe from his grave, the Northmen were defeated in battle by the men of Connaught. So to break the spell, they came at night, took up the body, and carrying it to the other side of the river, they buried the king with his face downwards that he might no longer frighten the armies of the north. If this story be true, and it is not unlikely, where was Rath O'Fiachrach where the king was first buried? and where was Aenach Locha Gille, on the other side of the river where they laid him so lowly in his grave?

It is evidently a matter of much interest to ascertain the site of this great battle, and identify the grave of this warrior king. Dr. O'Rorke, has discussed the question with much learning and ingenuity. He tries to show that the route of a northern army, invading Connaught, would lie close to the eastern slopes of Knocknarea, that the celebrated field of Carrowmore lay in their path, that the stone circle and cromlech of Carrowmore mark the graves of the warriors who fell on that fatal field, and that the body of the monarch, Eoghan Beul himself, was carried to the summit of the hill of Knocknarea, and that his grave is marked by the huge cairn on the mountain summit, which is known to the people as Misgan Meave, from its resemblance, as a great Irish scholar informed us, to the shape of a roll of butter—in Irish *Misgan*.

There is no doubt that the writer here argues with much force and great ingenuity. Still there are, in our opinion, fatal objections to this view. First of all the Irish *Life of St. Ccallach*, the sole authority for this narrative, as far as we know, states that Eoghan Bel or Beul ordered himself to be buried on the side of the hill by which the northerns pass when *flying* before the army of Connaught—*ar taobh na tulcha*. But *Tulach* (gen. *tulcha*) means in Irish “a little hill or hillock,”¹ and could never be applied to such a mountain

¹ *Joyce*, vol. i., page 375.

mass as Knocknarea. In its simplest form, anglicized as "Tully," it is applied to sixty-four townlands, not one of which contains a high hill like Knocknarea, and Dr. O'Rorke can find specimens of the hillocks that are called by the name of *Tulach* in Toomour, in Killadoon, in Killasbugbrone, in Calry, and in the well-known Tully Hill at Drumcliff, but none of them is anything more than a "small hill or rising ground."

Again, we think the Northerns, when flying before the Connaughtmen, would not be such fools as to keep on the slopes of Knocknarea, for even accepting the route laid down by Dr. O'Rorke as the usual one, it would still be too far out of their way when flying across the Sligo river, or even the Sligo estuary at Stand-alone-Point. But, what if the tide were in, or at half flow, or half ebb? They could not then possibly cross at Stand-alone-Point; and, although we agree with Dr. O'Rorke that the Northerns frequently crossed the river there, at low water or less than half tide, they could not possibly do so at any other time. In our opinion the usual passage over the river was over the fords, at or between the present bridges. Mr. Abraham Martin swore in his evidence before the Fisheries' Commission in 1845, that "if he were to leave the sluices open for twenty-four hours in each week it would drain off all the water in summer," and no doubt most of it, too, in winter. In this reach of the stream the fords were always passable except in very high floods; the Castle of Sligo was built to defend the passage of these fords; and, in our opinion, it was the usual passage by which the Northerns crossed the river, although if penetrating in Cuillerra or Tireragh, when they wished to avoid a foe guarding the fords of Sligo, they frequently crossed the estuary lower down at Stand-alone-Point, if the tide allowed them.

Our own opinion always was that the gallant Eoghan Beul was buried under the mound of the western hill of Carns. It is a *Tulach*; the grave mound is on that side by which the routed Northerns would fly before the Connaughtmen over the fords of Sligo; it is, moreover, close to their shortest line of march; and can still be seen by any traveller, either from the mail coach road or the railway, both of

which, in our opinion, pass quite close to the usual route followed by the invading and retreating Northmen. If we be asked for any proof beyond the circumstantial evidence for this assertion, we confess we have none, but neither has the Archdeacon, so in this respect we are both on equal terms.

The Archdeacon thinks that he has established very conclusively the connection of the Carrowmore monuments with the Battle of Sligo. But let us ask this one thing; can there be cited any instance in Ireland or in any part of the Three Kingdoms in which a similar stone circle and cromlech were ever employed to mark the burial place of Christian warriors? We think not; and, although there is much more paganism than Christianity about the burial of Eoghan Beul himself the Archdeacon cannot use that argument, for he emphatically holds that the statement, that any of the Irish were then pagans, is at variance with all that is known of religion in Ireland about the time.¹ It is true he speaks of the Battle of Cuilreimhne, A.D. 555, according to the Four Masters; but we daresay he would readily admit that his statement equally applies to the soldiers in the Battle of Sligo, some twenty years earlier.

Dr. O'Rorke has written a very interesting chapter on the Parish of Calry. We think he has here very good reason for saying that he has corrected some of O'Donovan's mistakes. He appears to us to be quite right in his explanation of the word *Annagh*, as applied to Hazelwood, and certainly as applied to the larger district of Calry. He is really eloquent, too, in his description of the many scenic beauties of this charming district, which is not as much known, nor perhaps as fully appreciated either by tourists or antiquarians as it ought to be, and as it doubtless will be in future, thanks to Dr. O'Rorke's history. The Grianan, or Sunny Hill of Calry, was traditionally said to be the most beautiful spot in Ireland, but there are so many sunny hills and bowers of beauty in Calry that the antiquarians differ as to which is the original and genuine Grianan. Major Wood Martin, in his *History of Sligo*, makes it out to be a hill which Dr. O'Rorke

¹ Vol. ii., page 5.

characterizes as "a despicable little hill, destitute of every element of beauty." The Doctor, however, declares that he himself has certainly found it, and that it is as bright and charming as ever, but unfortunately it is outside the present parish of Calry, near the eastern extremity of Lough Gill, though it still bears its name of the Grianan. Calry abounds in antiquarian remains, the most interesting of which is now known as the Giant's Grave or Druid's Altar in the Deerpark. It has proved quite a puzzle to the antiquarians, but although the Archdeacon himself cannot well say what it was, he is quite certain that Major Wood Martin was mistaken in pronouncing it to be "a fine specimen of a pagan sepulchre." His description, however, of this antiquarian riddle is very full and very interesting, but as he thoroughly despises the "pre-historic times," and all "their nondescript relics," he is inclined to regard it as "a fixture of rather modern origin probably connected in some way with the far-famed games of Calry." We regret that we cannot at all agree with the historian in assigning "a rather modern origin"—although the word is a wide one—to this most interesting structure.

Dr. O'Rorke overthrows O'Donovan and the Major in Tirerrill as well as in Calry. We readily accept his identification of the ancient Aenach Tiroililla with the place called Cul na Braher, near Ballysadare, in opposition to O'Donovan, who identified it with Carn Oililla, now known as Heaps-town, near the northern extremity of Lough Arrow. He is probably right, too, in his explanation of the word Knock-narea, the name of a very conspicuous hill near Sligo, which he takes to signify the Hill of *the smooth flat summit—cnoc na reidh*—rejecting O'Connor's idea that it meant the "Hill of the Moon," and O'Donovan's "Hill of the Executions."

Dr. O'Rorke gives an excellent chapter on the celebrated Battle of Cuildreimhne. We have no doubt that he correctly identifies this famous battle field with Cooldruman, a townland on the very crest of the ridge, running from the nose of Benbulbin to Magherow. Here it was that the Northern hosts, led on by the princes of Tir Owen and Tir Conal, met in fierce conflict the army of Diarmaid Mac Cearbhaill, then monarch of Ireland, whom they completely defeated with

the loss of 3,000 of his troops. It is said that it was for his share in provoking this battle that Columcille was ordered by his confessor, St. Molaise of Innismurray, to go and preach the Gospel in Caledonia, and never look upon his native land again. Columcille felt himself aggrieved by the action of the monarch in denying him a copy of the Gospels, which he himself had made from St. Finian's MS., though without his permission; and, again, by his seizing a young Connaught prince who fled to him for sanctuary at Tará. He appealed for redress to his kinsmen, the princes of the north, and these fiery spirits resolved to avenge the wrongs of their cousin, who was even then regarded as a saint. Columba himself went to the battle, and by his prayers, it is said, greatly contributed to the victory of the north. St. Finian, on the other hand, is said to have blessed the banners of the men of Meath. They were however routed with great slaughter on the ridge of Cooldruman, whilst only one man of the army under Columcille's protection was slain, and he fell because he transgressed the command of the Saint by crossing a line which Columcille had forbidden him to cross. The name of this soldier was Maglainne, and Dr. O'Rorke ingeniously argues that the line which he crossed was the Drumcliffe river, that he fell on its banks, or was, perhaps, drowned in the stream; that from him it got the name of Laine—not, be it observed, of Maglainne—and that Inis na Laine, in Carbury Mor, where some sixty persons were burned to death in A.D. 1029, was not, as O'Donovan's thinks, "Sword Island," which some have identified with Oyster Island, and others with Innismurray, but that it was the eastern crannoge of Glencar Lake—the lake and island taking their name from the river, as the river did from the fallen warrior.

We entirely agree with Dr. O'Rorke that Inis na Laine must be the eastern crannoge of Glencar Lake. His reasons, which we cannot give here, are most ingenious, and most convincing; and what is more, this happy identification is quite original, and due to him alone. We are not so sanguine about the origin of the name, for if the river got its name from Maglainne—why was it not called Maglainne?

The Archdeacon disagrees, too, with O'Donovan, who infers from the language attributed to Columcille before the battle, that many of the monarch's troops were pagans. The Saint speaks of his enemies as "the host which marches round the cairns," and then appeals to his druid, who is the Son of God, and who will not refuse him help in his need. Dr. O'Rorke denies that there were any pagans in the armies of the King of Tara and alleges that if these lines are rightly understood, they furnish no proof of druidism in the hosts of King Diarmaid. Besides, there is, he adds, no proof that druidism was a religion at all—it was merely a philosophy—erratic perhaps, but not, let us say, damnable.

We cannot accept these suggestions. Druidism was in our opinion a religion, and Cæsar, who doubtless personally knew the druids, both of Gaul and Britain, expressly says so. "Illi [druides] rebus divinis intersunt, sacrificia publica et privata procurant, religiones interpretantur."¹

We think, too, that there were druids and pagans in the army of King Diarmaid, and we know from the lives of certain saints that there were some of them there then, and long after, in certain remote districts of the country—in Omev Island for instance, when visited by St. Fechin, in the seventh century. And what can be the meaning of the "Erbhe Druadh," mentioned by the Annalists, except some druidic enchantment which the sorcerers of King Diarmaid had recourse to in order to protect their followers in battle? We know from the *Annals of Ulster*, that it was something which Fraechan, son of Temnan, had made for King Diarmaid, and that it was thrown "over head" by one who was doubtless another druid, Tuatan, son of Diman; and "Magla' nne, who passed over it, alone was slain,"² not drowned in the river. "Solus occisus est" are the words in the *Annals of Ulster*. And because King Diarmaid had recourse to these druidical charms, Columcille appeals to the Son of God as his druid to protect the armies of the North in their conflict with the host "that marches round a cairn," which was probably another of these druidical rites, practised by Diarmaid's soldiers before they began the battle. We

¹ *De Bello Gallico* IV., c. xiii.

² *Annals of Ulster*, A.D. 560.

regret that we cannot at present discuss this interesting question at greater length.

Dr. O'Rorke treats of the ecclesiastical history of the county in a very interesting and exhaustive manner. His chapter on "The Abbey" of Sligo contains a very full and graphic account of that once celebrated house, which De Burg declared to be the most beautiful of all the Dominican foundations in Ireland. In another chapter of great interest, the author gives an account of the introduction of Christianity into County Sligo, and the foundation of its primitive churches. Here, too, Dr. O'Rorke claims to be original, and sometimes boldly sets aside the authority of such men as O'Donovan, and Hennessy, and Colgan.

It is stated both in the Irish *Tripartite*, and in *Tirechan's Collections*, that St. Patrick went from Elphin to "Dumecha Hua n Ailella," as it is in the Irish, or "ad Dumecham nepotum Ailello," as it is in the Latin of Tirechan, and there founded a church called Senchell Dumaigi, or the Old Church of the Mound, or Sand-hill, over which he placed his disciples, Machet, Cetchen, and Rodan. Thither also came Mathona, a sister of St. Benignus, and she there received the veil from Patrick and Rodan, and became a nun of theirs—"monacha," in the Irish "manchess." "Then she went across the mountain of the Hua Ailella, and founded a noble church in Tamnach . . . and she made friendship with the relics of St. Rodan, and their successors feasted together."

This Senchell Dumaigi has been generally identified with Senchell near Elphin, where both the mound and the foundations of a celebrated old church, still bearing that name, are yet to be seen.

But Dr. O'Rorke identifies this "Senchell Dumaigi," with Corradoo, or rather Corradooey, a townland near Ballinafad, in the parish of Aghanagh. Corradoo or Corradooey, according to Joyce, means the "round hill of the tumulus or mound"—that is a round hill with a mound on its summit, but so far as we know, the name of Senchell or Shankill has never been connected with Corradooey; there is no trace of an old church there, although it seems there was once a nunnery in the neighbouring townland of Carricnahorna.

Dr. O'Rorke's reasons are rather negative than positive. The Senchell Dumaigi was, he says, clearly in the territory of the Hua Ailella, but Shankill, near Elphin is far away from Tirerrill, and cannot possibly be the place. Besides the narrative shows that Senchell was not very far from Tannach—their successors feasted together—but Tannach, north of Lough Arrow, is a long way indeed from Shankill—much too long to drive to dinner.

Shankill is far from Tirerrill now, it is true, but was it then? Hy Fiachrach at one time, as Dr. O'Rorke himself admits, included most of the barony of Carbury, and why not the ancient Hua Ailella include the barony of Boyle? As a matter of fact, there is very good reason to suppose that it did, and perhaps, even a larger territory. It is quite clear from a passage of the *Tripartite* that the church of Kilmore of Moyglass, south of Jamestown, was in the ancient Hua Ailella, and the small territory of Corcu Achland, in which Elphin was situated, is in the same place described as situated to the north of Slieve Badgna, and to the south of Hua Ailella, or, as it is said in the Irish *Tripartite*, on this side the Hua Ailella—showing that this district was in immediate contiguity with the territory of the Hua Ailella. We believe, if Dr. O'Rorke had adverted to his passage, he could not so confidently declare that Shankill, near Elphin, was far from the ancient Tirerrill. In our opinion it was within the Tirerrill of that time, but just on the boundary line. The Archdeacon, however, argues with much force and ingenuity in favour of Corradoeey, and his opinion is entitled to great weight.

Coming to more modern times Dr. O'Rorke gives a very interesting account of the celebrated Malachy O'Queely, Archbishop of Tuam, who was slain by the Parliamentarians under Coote, somewhere near Sligo, at a place called Claragh or Clara, but which it was reserved for him to identify. He shows, we think, very clearly that this Clara, or Claragh, must be the place now called Cleveragh, near Sligo, on the left bank of the river. We gladly call attention to this happy identification because in our notice of Dr. O'Rorke's *History of the Parishes of Ballysadare and Kilvarnet*, we complained

of his omitting to make any reference to the death of Malachy O'Queely, which we then alleged took place near Colooney. We gladly admit that Dr. O'Rorke then had, as he told us in a private letter, excellent reasons for believing that O'Queely was killed not near Colooney, but near Sligo.

We regret we cannot endorse or accept the Archdeacon's views regarding the absence of all civilization in pre-Christian Ireland. He declares that intelligent students of our national history are now coming to admit with Strabo, P. Mela, Tacitus, Julius Solinus, Camden, Ware, Sir James Ferguson, and Father Innes, that "Ireland in those times was *utterly unlettered and barbarous*." We deny the fact, and we reject the alleged testimony in favour of the fact. Who are the intelligent students, whose authority is superior to that of men like O'Curry and O'Donovan? Do the authorities quoted really make this assertion, and if they do what weight is to be attached to their testimony?

Ptolemy is quite as good an authority as Strabo, and as the Archdeacon himself admits, he speaks of a great city as flourishing somewhere in Connaught, and of several other cities in various parts of Ireland. Tacitus, who said that Ireland was situated midway between Britain and Spain cannot be regarded as much of an authority. In any case his statement that the Irish ports were in his days better frequented than those of Gaul or Britain, of itself refutes the sweeping assertion of Dr. O'Rorke. Where there is commerce there must be some civilisation, and it is manifestly absurd to suppose that foreign merchants from Britain, Gaul, and the shores of the Mediterranean, acquainted with the letters and civilization of the Roman Empire, could continue to frequent the Irish ports and leave no tincture of their letters and civilization behind them. We have in another place given our reasons at some length for admitting the use of letters and a considerable degree of civilization in Ireland during the reign of Cormac MacArt—two centuries before the preaching of St. Patrick. We cannot repeat them here, but we must take the liberty of asserting that the antiquated views of Camden, Ware, Sir James Ferguson, and Father Innes, are now being generally abandoned, and that the

more careful study of our ancient language, and of our ancient monuments is now causing "intelligent students" to begin to admit that in pre-Christian times Ireland was not altogether unlettered, and can only be described as barbarous in the classical sense that she was outside the sphere of Greek and Roman conquest and civilization.

We have expressed our opinion of Dr. O'Rorke's work with much candour and freedom—it is, we think, what he would do himself, and what he will not object to being done by others. The praise of a critic who merely writes to praise is generally worthless. We dissent from some of his views, but we most cordially thank him for the pleasure and information that we have derived from the perusal of these two splendid volumes, so eloquently written, so carefully printed, and so well illustrated with excellent maps and woodcuts. No one at all interested in the history of the county will begin to read the book who will not finish it. No Sligo man can read the opening pages of Chapter III., in which the writer describes so faithfully and so vividly the natural beauties that gladden the eye all round Sligo, without feeling proud both of his native county and its accomplished historian. He will view these ancient monuments and picturesque scenes with double interest and higher pleasure when he knows something of the historic and religious associations that will recall to his mind the memories of a not inglorious past. It was nature that built up round Sligo that glorious amphitheatre in which are blended so many scenic charms—the haughty crests of many-topped hills, the lustrous woodlands, the sun-lit lake, and the laughing river, the verdure of its meadows, and the glory of the sea; but it was reserved for the pen of the historian to clothe this fairy region with a higher kind of human interest, and to give a voice to the vanished spirits of the past. For doing this we are all grateful to Dr. O'Rorke. We are confident that his *History of Sligo* will come to be recognised as the standard authority on those points of interest which he discusses; and that Sligo men of the future will be even still more grateful to him than we are for leaving them such a record of the history of their native county.

ORIGIN, NATURE AND USE OF THE PALLIUM.

NATURE OF THE PALLIUM.—The Pallium is, materially considered, a white woollen band of circular shape, about three fingers broad, worn over the breast and shoulders, the single band falling down in front, adorned with four black crosses, and fastened with three golden pins. Anciently these crosses were of a red or purple colour; but since the time of Innocent III. the crosses have been black, although the reason for changing the colour has not been ascertained.¹ In the formal or legal sense of the word, the Pallium is defined to be “the characteristic ornament of archbishops and other superior prelates, taken from the body of St. Peter, granted by the Pope alone, and symbolising and conferring the plenitude of the pastoral power.” It is said to be taken from the body of St. Peter, because in ancient times it was customary to preserve the Pallia in the *Confession* of St. Peter, and under the altar beneath which the bodies of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul repose—“Per Canonicos Basilicæ ponuntur super corpora Petri et Pauli Apostolorum sub altari majori, ubi factis de more vigiliis, illa per noctem dimittunt, deinde restitunt subdiaconis, qui in loco honesto ea conservant.”² As we shall see further on, the same custom is still observed before the Pallia are solemnly blessed by the Pope, or the Cardinal who officiates in his stead.

ORIGIN OF THE PALLIUM.—There are three different opinions regarding the origin of the Pallium. According to De Marca and writers of his school, it was originally an imperial ornament worn by the Roman emperors, which Constantine, after the peace of the Church, permitted Pope Sylvester to wear as the symbol of supreme authority, and which he

¹ *De Angelis*, vol. i., p. 163.

² Benedictus XIV., *Constit.* vol. ii., page 494.

authorised him also, in certain cases, to grant as a special privilege to others. Hence they say, as it was treasonable by the Roman law to wear the imperial ornaments without special licence, we find that Virgilius asked the permission of Justinian, as St. Gregory the Great did of the Emperor Maurice, to grant the Pallium to certain prelates. There is no foundation, however, for this opinion, except the alleged donation of certain privileges to St. Sylvester by Constantine, amongst others to wear—Phrygium et super humerale videlicet lorum, quod imperiale circumdare assolet collum. This band, thrown over the shoulders and round the neck of the emperor, was, according to Antonius de Dominis, the original Pallium which the emperor permitted the Popes to use. This document is in Gratian's *Decree*; but every scholar now recognises it as one of the forgeries of the Pseudo-Isidore, and consequently of no weight whatever. As to St. Gregory and Virgilius asking the imperial permission to grant the Pallium, they did so because they feared that otherwise the grant of the Pallium to foreign prelates might be regarded by emperors, or their minions, as an attempt to secure the protection of foreign princes at the expense of their own allegiance to the empire.

Others think that the Pallium, though of purely ecclesiastical origin, was worn by the Popes in imitation of the rational and superhumeral worn by the High Priests of the Old Law.¹ Baronius seems to adopt this as the more probable opinion, and it is adopted by several eminent canonists.

A third opinion, however, traces the origin of the Pallium to St. Linus, the immediate successor of St. Peter, who, as such, wore the Pallium of the Prince of the Apostles, and ordained that it should be worn by his successors to signify that the lawful successors of St. Peter inherited from him the fulness of the Apostolic power. We have, in favour of this opinion, the high authority of St. Maximus, Bishop, who, in his sermon, *De Veste Sacerdotali*, says—"In lege gratiae antiquum est illud nostrum Ephod (id est Pallium) quod nostri Patriarchae arbitrantur a Lino post Petrum

¹ See *Exod.* xxviii., 4.

secundo Romano Pontifice institutum, et in singularis potestatis privilegium nostris primis praesulibus datum."

One thing at least is certain, that the use of the Pallium is very ancient in the Church, both Eastern and Western. For Gregory the Great refers to it expressly in his letter ¹ to the Bishops of Illyrium; and Pope Symmachus ² (498-514), when granting it to Theodore, declares that he does so *more majorum*, that is, in accordance with ancient practice.

PREPARATION, BENEDICTION, AND GRANTING OF THE PALLIUM.—The wool from which the Pallium is made is prepared in a special and significant manner. On the Festival of St. Agnes, the nuns of her monastery, in the Nomentane Way, make an offering of two white lambs at the altar, just at the moment when the *Agnus Dei* of the Mass is being sung. The lambs are then taken charge of by two canons of St. John Lateran, who have them cared and fed until the proper time for shearing. The pure white wool of these two lambs is then mixed with more white wool of similar texture, and from the mixture the Pallia are spun and woven.

We have a special constitution of Benedict XIV. in which that learned Pontiff prescribes the manner of blessing and granting the Pallium. After referring to the ancient rites of blessing the Pallium, the Pontiff ordains the rule to be followed in future. A sufficient number of Pallia shall be prepared, and on the Vigil of St. Peter and Paul's Day, shall be carried by the Canon Sacristan of the Basilica, attended by the customary retinue, to the *Confession* of the blessed Peter. They are to be carried on a golden dish, and placed on the table of the altar, which is covered with a cloth richly adorned, between two candelabra with lighted candles. After Vespers to be celebrated in the Basilica by the Pontiff himself, or by a Cardinal, the celebrant shall go down to the *Confession* of St. Peter attended by certain ministers and guards, and solemnly bless the Pallia, which should be placed before him by one of the Auditors of the Apostolic Palace. The blessing over, the Pallia are to be placed in a box of silver, gilt with gold—*arca argentea*

¹ Lib. ii., Epist. 22.

² Epist. 11., *Apud Labbeum*. T. v.; col. 440.

auro obducta—which box should always be kept in the *Confession* of the blessed Apostle, and near his sacred Body. The box, itself, of exquisitely embossed workmanship, was made by the special order of the Pope for that purpose, and was by him offered to the blessed Peter in remission of his sins. It was to remain under the custody of the Canon Sacristan of the Basilica ; but the key was to be kept by the First Master of Ceremonies.

The prelate who is entitled to use the Pallium should make application for it within three months after his consecration, or if he should have been already consecrated, within three months after the confirmation of his appointment to the new see. That application is made in Consistory through one of the consistorial advocates, who is specially constituted procurator for the purpose, and who, in the name of the new prelate, demands the Pallium from the Pope *instante*, *instantius*, *et instantissime*. The procurator then retires, the Pope consults the Cardinals, and, of course, grants the request. The senior of the Cardinal-deacons is authorised to confer the Pallium, and names a day and place for the purpose. Sometimes the Cardinal grants the Pallium in the private oratory of his own house ; but not unfrequently especially when received by great prelates in person, it is conferred by the Cardinal-deacon at the great altar of St. Peter's. Then the prelate, kneeling on the altar step, begs the Pallium from the Cardinal-deacon, who stands at the right corner of the altar, in the following words:—"Ego N., electus ecclesiae N. *instante*, *instantius*, *et instantissime* peto mihi tradi et assignari Pallium de corpore B. Petri sumptum, in quo est plenitudo Pontificalis officii." But if the Pallium is conferred not on the prelate personally, but through his procurator, then the latter asks it in the name of the prelate as above, but he is required to swear solemnly:—"et promitto illud reverenter portare eidem Rev. Patri D. et nec pernoctabo in aliquo loco nisi una nocte tantum, nisi prepeditus fuero legitime, et tunc in cathedrali ipsius (aut collegiata, aut parochiali ecclesia) remittam et honorifice-reponam, sic me Deus adjuvet et hac sancta Dei evangelia." Not unfrequently it happens that a bishop is constituted

procurator for his archbishop, to receive and bear him the Pallium. The clause in which the procurator promises not to remain more than one night in any place, though given in the older form of the oath (*vide* Ferraris vol. I, page 770 Migne's edition), is omitted from the Benedictine constitution.

USE OF THE PALLIUM.—The law regarding the use of the Pallium is contained in the First Book of the Decretals—*Titulus Octavus de Auctoritate et Usu Pallii*, and has remained practically unchanged since the time of Gregory IX. It is summed up in seven brief and clear chapters.

I. The archbishop may use his Pallium *within* any church of his province; but when going in procession outside the church, even though clothed in his sacred vestments, he may not use the Pallium. Ferraris, however, thinks that if the multitude of people rendered it necessary to celebrate *prae foribus ecclesiae*, he might in that case use his Pallium; it is morally as it were within the church. It seems too (from the chapter—*Quod sicut* 28 *de Flectione*) that it is not lawful for the archbishop to hold a Provincial Synod without his Pallium—*non licet Archiepiscopo sine Pallio convocare concilium*—and it is stated by Petra that Benedict XIII., when Archbishop of Benevento and St. Charles at Milan always wore the Pallium in their Provincial Synods, which of course were held in the church.¹

II. The archbishop may not lend his Pallium, because it is his personal ornament and should be buried with him. If it is burned or lost, he should make application for a new one.

If transferred to another see he should get another Pallium and no longer use the first one, but he should carry it with him to be placed under his head after his death, the last Pallium being placed, as in life, over his vestments around his neck. If the prelate has resigned his See he can no longer wear his Pallium; and if the Pallium has been granted, but the prelate is unable to wear it, then it should be burned, and the ashes thrown into the Sacramentum,² according to a decree of the S. Congr. of Rites (14th May, 1606).

III. The Pallium confers the plenitude of the Apostolic Office, and the title of archbishop; nor, says Innocent III.,

¹ Ferraris, No. 22, 29.

² Craisson, No. 853.

should any one call himself an archbishop before he has received the Pallium from us *non tamen deberet se archiepiscopum appellare priusquam a nobis Pallium suscepisset*. Hence the new Prelate, except prevented by lawful impediment, is bound under penalty of forfeiting his dignity to apply for the Pallium within three months from the date of his consecration, or if consecrated, of his confirmation; but it may be done personally or by procurator. Strictly speaking then, the prelate has no right to his title of archbishop until he gets his Pallium, and he may not during the interval exercise any of those episcopal functions which usually require the Pallium when exercised by an archbishop. He may, however, perform all other episcopal functions, and depute another prelate to perform the special functions forbidden to him without the Pallium.

IV. The Roman Pontiff alone has the right during the celebration of Mass to wear the Pallium everywhere and always; for he alone possesses the fulness of that Apostolic authority which is symbolized by the Pallium. Others may not use it except in their own churches and on certain days, because their jurisdiction is limited both as to place and persons—they are called, *in partem sollicitudinis non in plenitudinem potestatis*. The Pallium is accordingly granted only to Patriarchs, Primate and Archbishops who have their own flocks; but not to Bishops or titular Archbishops, even if they should be Cardinals. Some Bishops, however, have the use of the Pallium by special privilege granted to their sees, or to themselves: such are the Bishops of Ostia, Pavia, Lucca, Bamberg; and in France, of Autun, Le Puy, and Marseilles. But it is then a mere prerogative of honour, and neither entitles the wearer to take precedence of his seniors by consecration, nor exempts him from the jurisdiction of his archbishop—(*De Angelis*). The days on which the Pallium may be worn at Mass are the principal festivals of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, and the Apostles, the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, and All Saints' Day, as also at the dedication of churches, the ordination of clerics, the consecration of bishops, on the anniversary of the Prelate's consecration, and the principal feasts of his church.

The fifth, sixth and seventh chapters of this same title are merely explanatory of the others, and contain nothing new. Chapter the fifth emphatically asserts that the archbishop cannot use the Pallium outside his own province in any circumstances, that any custom to the contrary is an abuse and corruptela, although the Pontiff, by special grace and in very special circumstances, allowed the Archbishop of Compostella to use the Pallium outside his own province, but only with the consent of the Prelate in whose church he was allowed to officiate.

The sixth chapter restricts the use of the Pallium to the cases where the prelate is *missarum celebrationibus constitutus* within his own province and within the church; and in the seventh, Honorius III. permits the prelate to celebrate without the Pallium either within or without his diocese, because, he adds, it is only on those days expressed in his privilege that he ought to celebrate with the Pallium. Hence it is not allowed to use the Pallium in Masses for the dead, for they may not be celebrated on these privileged days.

In the schismatical Greek Church all the bishops use a Pallium, which is called by them omophorion, because worn over the shoulders; but it is of a different form from the Latin Pallium, and is laid aside by the prelate during Mass from the Gospel to the Communion, when it is resumed. It is said that this privilege of wearing the Pallium was first extorted from John XI., in favour of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and was by him and his successors granted to all their suffragans without the permission of the Roman Pontiff. In the Council of Lateran, however, the great Patriarchs in communion with the Pope were allowed, after having themselves received the Pallium from the Pope, to grant it to their suffragans entitled to use it, on condition, however, of taking the oath of fidelity and obedience.¹ But at the present day even the four great titular Patriarchs though in communion with Rome are not allowed the use of the Pallium, because they have no clergy and flock of their own.²

We know little or nothing of the use of the Pallium in the Irish Church before the time of Cardinal Papiro, who

¹ Ferraris, sub *Pallium*.

² *De Ang. Hoc.* tit. no. 6.

came to this country shortly after Michaelmas in 1151. He remained during the winter, and on Laetare Sunday in the spring of 1152 he convened a great synod at Kells, in which he conferred four Pallia on the four Archbishops who were present at the synod—Gelasius of Armagh (the Primate), Donnald O'Lonergan, "Archbishop of Munster," Gregory, "Bishop of Dublin," and Maelisa O'Connachtain, "Bishop of Eastern Connaught." So these prelates are respectively described in an extract from the Annals of Clonenagh (apud Colgan T. Th. p. 306) which is manifestly a perfectly accurate and authentic account of this Council, given apparently by one of those present at the synod, who gives the exact date of opening and closing the synod, the names of the prelates present, their number, their sees, their titles, and the principal acts of the synod. From this we may fairly infer that Armagh and Cashel were then recognised as archbishoprics, but that Dublin and Tuam had not previously been so recognised.

Gerald Barry indeed states that before the advent of Cardinal Papiro there were no archbishops in Ireland, and he has been severely taken to task by Usher, Colgan, and Lynch, for that audacious statement. Yet in the juridical sense at least Gerald Barry was perfectly right, for as Innocent III. emphatically proclaimed at the very time that Gerald Barry was writing, no man is entitled to the name or jurisdiction of an archbishop who has not received the Pallium from the Pope, and there is not a particle of trustworthy evidence to show that the Pallium had been previously used in Ireland. Indeed, St. Bernard, in his Life of St. Malachy, states expressly that it never was used even in Armagh *from the beginning*. Colgan tries to explain away the force of this observation, but we think its meaning is evident to every impartial reader. "*Metropoliticae sedi deerat adhuc, et defuerat ab initio usus Palli.*" Yet it is at the same time evident from the language of St. Bernard, that Armagh was commonly recognised long before the advent of Papiro as the Metropolitan See, not only of the northern province, but of all Ireland. We cannot, however, for the present enter further into the discussion of this most interesting question.

THE CONCURSUS FOR VACANT PARISHES.

THE common law of the Church, since the time of the Council of Trent, requires that, as a rule, a vacant parochial benefice shall be conferred only after a legitimate Concursus, and in each case on that candidate who shall be deemed by the Bishop the most worthy of those declared to be qualified by the Examiners. As some misunderstanding seems to exist regarding the real nature of this Concursus, we think it may be useful to point out exactly what the law requires for a legitimate Concursus. We do not propose in this short paper to enter into minute details, nor to discuss debated questions, but simply to lay down the provisions of the law, calling special attention to those points most likely to be misunderstood.

The law regarding the Concursus is contained primarily in the Decree of the Council of Trent, Sess. 24, c. 18, *Expedit*. But this Decree has been supplemented and explained (a) in the Constitution of Pius V. (18th March, 1566), then (b) by an Encyclical Letter of Clement XI. (10th January, 1721), prescribing the form of the Concursus, and (c) finally by the well-known Constitution, *Cum Illud*, of Benedict XIV. (n. 78 in Bullar.), in which that most learned Pontiff sums up and determines all the provisions of the law with his usual clearness and accuracy.

It will be more convenient for us, however, to adopt the scientific rather than the historical method of treating the question.

I.—THE EXAMINERS.

There can be no legal Concursus where Synodal Examiners have not been first duly constituted in accordance with the Decree of the Council of Trent. This Decree is explained with great fulness by Benedict XIV. in his invaluable work, *De Syn. Dioeces.* Lib. iv., c. 7. Six Examiners at

least, but not more than twenty, must be "proposed" in the Synod by the Bishop or Vicar-General, and must "satisfy" the Synod and be "approved" by it. It is safer to take a vote on each name, but the vote may be open or secret, as the Bishop wishes.¹ If no objection is offered when the name is read, I daresay that would be a vote of approbation, but if any objection is offered, then a vote must be taken, or the name must be withdrawn. A majority of the *Synodales* will decide the question. In selecting the Examiners a preference should be given, if they be otherwise qualified, to masters, doctors, and licentiates in Theology or Canon Law; but any other clerics, even regulars, may, if qualified, be selected, and all those so selected in Synod must then and there, if present—or, if not, afterwards before the Bishop or his Vicar—take an oath on the Holy Gospels or the relics of the Saints, that they will faithfully discharge their duty uninfluenced by any human affection whatsoever. Neither can they accept "*occasione hujus examinis nec ante nec post*," anything whatsoever, without incurring the guilt of simony and all its consequences. The Council itself implies elsewhere that the vacant benefice should bear the expenses of the *Concursus*, so that although it is certain the Examiners cannot even dine at the expense of the candidates, or any of them, still we might venture to hope that this stringent clause does not prevent them from dining at the expense of the vacant benefice.

Of the Synodal Examiners, the Bishop selects at each vacancy three or more to hold the *Concursus*, but there must be three at least besides the Bishop or his Vicar-General. The office of the Synodal Examiners only holds until the next *annual* Synod. If the number is reduced to less than six during the year, the Bishop may fill up the vacancies to complete the minimum number of six. If the annual Synod is not regularly held, those named in the last Synod continue competent Examiners even beyond the year, so long as *six* of *them survive*, but no longer. If in these circumstances the requisite number cannot be had, then recourse must be had to the Holy See for authority to appoint pro-Synodal Examiners,

¹ Sacra Congr. Concilii, 11th July, 1592.

or a new Synod must be convened where they can be appointed in the ordinary way. The Holy See will readily grant permission in these cases to appoint pro-Synodal Examiners.

II.—NOTICE OF THE CONCURSUS AND NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES.

When the vacancy actually occurs, the first duty of the Bishop is to appoint at once—*statim*—if necessary, an administrator to take charge of the parish until a rector shall have been duly selected.

The next duty of the Bishop or Vicar-General is to give due notice of the Concursus. For parishes to which the Bishop has free collation this notice must be given within six months¹ of the vacancy, by public edict setting forth the date of the Concursus, which must be held at a time not less than ten nor more than twenty days from the date of the edict itself. If held *infra decem dies* from the publication of the edict, the Concursus would not, it seems, be invalid; but if any intending candidate complained that due notice had not been given, then, if the Examiners had not yet reported, he might and ought to be examined, otherwise the proceedings would be invalid.² It is likely, but I do not find it expressly stated, that affixing the Latin edict to the doors of the Cathedral Church would be deemed sufficient publication in the sense of the law.

The Council of Trent says that the Bishop (where he has free collation) should himself nominate worthy clerics to be examined by the appointed Examiners, but at the same time it permits others to nominate suitable candidates for examination, and adds that if the Bishop or Provincial Synod thinks it judicious, all comers may be invited by public edict to the examination. Benedict XIV. seems to require this public edict in every case, and, *per se loquendo*, no fit candidate, whether parish priest or curate, diocesan or stranger, can be repelled from the examination. In practice, however, it would probably be found that only those candidates nominated by the Bishop or by some dignitary of the Diocese as fit

¹ See Ferraris, *sub voce*, Art. iii., n. 4.

² Ferraris, n. 12.

and proper persons would have any chance of succeeding at the Concursus.

The episcopal edict should also require the candidates to send in to the Secretary before the day of examination proofs of their qualifications, services, and offices, as well as testimonial letters, both judicial and extra-judicial, and other documents of a similar character, which may aid the Examiners in forming a judgment on the relative merits of the various candidates. These documents are to be all kept in the custody of the Episcopal Secretary, who is to form an abstract of same, setting forth the substance of these documents in each case for the information of the Examiners. Copies of this abstract are to be furnished on the day of the examination to the Bishop, and to each of the Examiners, and the originals are to be at hand when required.

III.—THE FORM OF CONCURSUS.

The mode of conducting the Concursus is fully set forth by the Congregation of the Council in the Encyclical of Clement XI. This special form, in all its details, is not necessary *sub poena nullitatis* ; but, if adopted, it throws the *onus probandi gravamen* on the appellant in case of appeal, and, moreover, commends itself to all men as the simplest and fairest method of procedure. First, then, the same questions should be set to all ; the same time should be allowed to all for answering ; and all the candidates should be in the same room, working under the strictest supervision, so that there should be no means of using or of communicating with each other, or with outsiders. The answers, except the exposition of the Gospel text, are to be written in Latin, signed by the candidate, and countersigned by the Secretary, Examiners, and Ordinary. This is necessary to guard against fraud, especially in cases of appeal.

The questions set to the candidates should include in Dogmatic Theology the exposition and proof of some points of doctrine, a certain number of questions in Moral Theology, including cases, and a text from the Gospels, on which the candidate is to write a plain homily in the vernacular suited to

the capacity of the people. The choice of the questions, and of the subject-matter, is, to a great extent, left to the discretion of the Examiners.

In estimating the literary and theological knowledge of the candidates, Benedict XIV. says that the Examiners should test the facility and skill of each of the candidates in the oral exposition of some doctrinal question, taken from the Holy Fathers, or the Council of Trent, or the Roman Catechism—in other words, their facility in giving catechetical instruction. Moreover, they must weigh carefully the relative merits of the answers given to each of the written questions, and especially the solidity (*gravitas*), and the literary skill (*elegantia*), displayed by the candidates in the written homily on the Gospel text.

But learning (*doctrina*) is only one of the things which the Examiners are to take into account in forming their judgment. The Council of Trent expressly requires fitness in point of “age, morals, learning, prudence and other qualities” requisite for the pastors of souls—and these qualities are *cumulatively* required; so that a notable deficiency in any of the four mentioned, would render the candidate unfit for the office which he seeks. This is a very important point which is frequently overlooked. Learning is necessary, but by no means sufficient. Age, character, and prudence must also be taken into account; and the most learned candidate may be disqualified, if he is deficient—notably deficient—in any of these respects. Furthermore, Benedict XIV. expressly says that, in addition to these fundamental qualifications, services already rendered to the Church, the laudable discharge of duties in the past, and other things, too, the ornaments and fruits of virtue, should also be taken into account by the Examiners. And why not? If a man has spent the best years of his life, with much fruit, in a laborious mission; if he has built churches, and schools, and parochial houses; if he has risked his life for his flock, during years of pestilence and famine; if he has wearied heart and brain in trying to keep his classes in the Seminary in something like a decent state of proficiency; if he has spent the leisure, that others sometimes give to profitless

amusements, in literary labours that instruct and edify the faithful and adorn the Church : why should not these things—*spectabilium virtutum ornamenta*, as the great Pontiff calls them—be taken into account by the Examiners in pronouncing on the merits of the candidates ?

It must be also carefully borne in mind, that the duty of the Examiners, in pronouncing their vote, is simply to determine the fitness or unfitness of each candidate, in these respects for the benefice in question. “Peracto deinde examine, renuntientur quotcumque ab his *idonei* judicati fuerint aetate moribus, doctrina, prudentia ex hisque episcopus eum eligat quem caeteris magis idoneum judicaverit.” So the Council of Trent carefully words its Decree.

It is the duty of the Examiners, therefore, or a majority of them, to return the names of *all* who are “fit ;” but it is the Bishop alone who has the right of choosing the fittest—*prae caeteris magis idoneus*—from amongst those declared by the Examiners to be *idonei*. Some writers held the Bishop was free to make his own choice amongst the *idonei*, without any obligation of choosing the fittest ; but Innocent XI. expressly condemned that opinion, which is therefore no longer tenable. However, of that superior fitness, which he is bound to seek for, the Bishop is sole judge, and he may form his decision, not only from information obtained from the Concursus, but from any other source of information he may possess even though private and confidential. He may consult the Examiners, and ask what candidate, in their opinion, possesses superior merit ; but he is not bound to do so, and, even if he does consult them, he need not follow their judgment in that point much less still if they merely volunteer their opinion on the superior merit of any candidate. This is very clearly and emphatically stated by Benedict XIV.¹ who quotes from his own Encyclical these words : “Absoluto examine, ut cuique satis compertum est, sit tantummodo potestas Examinatoribus renuntiandi quotquot regendae ecclesiae idoneos judicaverunt, reservata uni episcopo electione dignioris.” “We do not,” he adds, “however, deny that the Bishop may, if he likes, before making his own decision, ask

¹ Lib. iv., c. viii., n. 6, *De Synodo*.

the opinion of the Examiners on this point also, in order to proceed with greater security in making his own choice."

The Board of Examiners is to consist of the Bishop himself, or his Vicar-General, and at least three of the Synodal Examiners. They are to frame the questions, preside at the Examinations, sign the papers, consider the answers, and, moreover, examine carefully, not only the literary merit of the competitors, but also all the other qualities to which we have already referred—otherwise the proceedings would be null and void.

They may also confer together on the merits of the candidates before recording their votes. They are then and there, before leaving, to record their votes for or against the fitness of each candidate. The voting may be open or secret. The Bishop or Vicar-General who presides at the examination has no vote in the first scrutiny, but if the votes are *pares aut singulares*, that is, if the number of votes for and against any candidate is equal, or if each Examiner, suppose, of the three, records his vote in favour of a different candidate, then the Chairman of the Board has a casting vote for or against, as the case may be. In other words, when the votes are *paria*, his vote will qualify or disqualify any candidate; when the votes are *singularia*, his vote will, it seems, qualify that candidate in whose favour it is given. Of course the Secretary will keep not only the papers of the candidates, but also a record of the voting, to be produced, if necessary, on appeal.

IV.—THE RIGHT OF APPEAL.

An appeal lies against the final decision on any of three grounds: (a) that the examination was "contra formam Tridentini," or (b) that there was a "mala relatio examinationum," or (c) an "irrationabile iudicium" in the final selection made by the Bishop. This appeal must, however, be lodged within ten days of the final announcement by the Bishop, and may be made either to the Metropolitan or directly to Rome. Heretofore it was unnecessary to prove a *gravamen* before holding a new Concursus, but now where the form prescribed by Clement XI. for holding the examination is

observed, the papers must be sent to the *judex ad quem*, and except it appears from the written documents and testimonies that there is a *prima facie gravamen*, the appeal will be no farther entertained, nor will a new Concursus be granted. It is very difficult to establish such a *gravamen*, and hence where the Concursus is properly conducted there is little danger of a successful appeal. This appeal, too, is only *in devolutivo*, and hence cannot prevent the candidate whom the Bishop elects from taking and keeping possession of his benefice pending the final decision. If the sentence is against the incumbent he can appeal to Rome, and that candidate finally conquers in whose favour two out of the three decisions concur. Except the Concursus therefore should be plainly invalid *ratione formae*, it is very rarely a candidate will venture to appeal with any chance of success against the "mala relatio" of the Examiners, or the "irrationabile judicium" of the Bishop. Moreover, the Bishop may sometimes have in his own conscience a satisfactory reason for electing one of the candidates which he can explain to the Metropolitan or to the Pope in a confidential communication, and which, if well-founded, will cause his decision to be upheld by the Court of Appeal.

V.—WHEN THE LAW REQUIRES A CONCURSUS.

The Council of Trent has itself excepted certain cases in which parochial churches may be conferred without a Concursus: first, where the revenues of the benefice are so small as not to be able to bear the expenses of such an examination; secondly, where no candidate is found to present himself for the Concursus; and thirdly, where on account of special circumstances, such as factions and dissensions, the holding of the Concursus might give rise to grave popular tumults or quarrels. In these cases the Ordinary, if in his conscience he judge it expedient, may after taking council with the Examiners, hold merely a private examination without observing the form prescribed by the Council.

But in all other cases the common law requires that the Concursus be held when the collator is a Bishop or other

ecclesiastical person; and Pius V. expressly declares to be null and void, "Omnes et singulas collationes, provisiones, institutiones, et quasvis dispositiones parochialium ecclesiarum praeter et contra formam ab eodem Concilio Tridentino praesertim in examine per concursum faciendo praescriptam, factas aut in futurum faciendas."

(a) The Bishop then, or Ordinary collator, in all parishes, is to make the collation, *prævio concursu*, within the space of six months from the vacancy, otherwise the collation is *ipso facto* reserved to the Apostolic See.

(b) In the case of parochial benefices generally or specially reserved to the Pope, the Bishop is to hold the Concursus, and either announce the *dignior*, or in certain cases send the results of the examination to the Dataria within the space of four months from the vacancy.

(c) When the benefice is of ecclesiastical *patronage* but the *institution* belongs to the Bishop, then it is the right of the patron to select the *dignior* after Concursus, to whom the Bishop is bound to give institution. But if the *institution* does not belong to the Bishop, but to some one else, then it is the right of the Bishop to select the *dignior*, and of the patron to present him for institution. Hence even when the Pope institutes, the Bishop holds the Concursus, and at least, as a rule, selects the *dignior*.¹

(d) But when the parish is one of lay or mixed patronage, then no Concursus is required, but the candidate presented by the patron must be examined by the Synodal Examiners, and if found worthy be accepted by the Bishop.

The object which the Church has in view in instituting the Concursus is to secure in the interests of the salvation of souls that none but fit and worthy pastors shall be appointed to the government of parishes. No doubt, the Bishop has in most cases ample opportunities of becoming acquainted with the various qualifications of the priests of his diocese, and it may be assumed that he will select only the most worthy for the government of parishes. It is, however, of very great importance that the younger clergy should be inspired with a spirit of labour and of study from the beginning of their

¹ See *De Synodo Dioecessana*, Lib. iv., c. viii.

missionary career, and for that purpose no other means so efficacious as the Concursus can possibly be devised. The thought of it is before the mind of the young priest, from the day he is ordained. He knows that his learning, his labours, his conduct, his services to the Church, will be thoroughly and impartially investigated not only by the Bishop, but, what is more important still, by three or four of his fellow-priests—the men who see him closest and know him best. He knows that he must not only be good, but even better than others of the same standing before he can hope to become rector of a parish. So long as human nature remains what it is, the knowledge that the Concursus is before them will always be for the generality of priests the very strongest possible motive to avoid evil and do good.

SPEECH ON EDMUND BURKE.¹

I am proud to have the privilege of advocating this resolution,² with your lordship³ in the chair, for reasons which it is unnecessary for me to particularise, and I am also proud to put it to this distinguished assembly of the citizens of Dublin. Your presence here this evening in such numbers, and the attention with which you have listened to the addresses is a striking proof that the memory of Edmund Burke is still green in the hearts of you all. But before I go further I hope you will excuse me if I wish to correct a great mistake. It is by pure accident, and by mistake, as it were, that Edmund Burke was born in Dublin. He ought to have been born in the County Galway. His family lived from the time of Strongbow, not, as I saw some newspapers say, in the County Limerick, but in the County Galway, and as a Galway man informed me in his own peculiar way some time ago—"You see," he said, "he would have been surely born here, but he was foolish enough to emigrate with his family to the County Cork a hundred years before he was born." Well, ladies and gentlemen, I must express my entire concurrence with the eloquent and noble views expressed by the lecturer⁴ of this evening, as well as deep sympathy with the sentiments so beautifully expressed by Professor Savage Armstrong. I would make some reservation about some things that were said by my friend Mr. Redington.⁵ But Galway men prefer to fight their battles at home.

Now, the first thing that strikes me is this: you have all

¹ At the Burke Centenary Commemoration which took place in Dublin on the 24th November, 1897.

² "That a public effort should be made to perpetuate the memory of Edmund Burke, and that the committee be authorised to determine the proper course to carry out this object."

³ The Marquess of Dufferin and Ava.

⁴ Rev. William Barry, D.D., author of *The New Antigone*.

⁵ The late Sir Christopher Redington, then Resident Commissioner of National Education.

heard those just and eloquent eulogies of Edmund Burke. If we are indeed sincere in the expression of our admiration for his genius and our gratitude for his splendid public services, then I think it clearly follows that we ought to take measures to give visible and enduring expression to these national sentiments of esteem and admiration. I entirely agree with all that Dr. Barry has said in his splendid eulogy of Burke ; but I would wish to give special prominence to two sterling qualities of Burke's great heart, fundamental to his character, which, in my opinion at least, should entitle him to the grateful and lasting affection of his fellow-countrymen. His excellent school-master, to whom he owed so much, and to whom he was always grateful, described Burke as a youth, "with an instinctive and invincible hatred of oppression." Well, in this, I think, Mr. Shakelton noted what was without doubt the keynote of his character and of his conduct, and which was developed more in the school at Ballytore than it would have been at that time in this city of Dublin. It was shown in the schoolroom at Ballytore, it was shown in the British House of Commons, and more than all it is revealed in colours that will never fade in his writings and in his public conduct. This hatred of oppression was also the source of those fiery outbursts of eloquence which astonished his contemporaries.

Mr. Morley notes the other distinctive trait in Burke's character, which was indeed the natural concomitant of the first, that "his perpetual mood was one of affectionate duty for his native land." These were in truth the well springs of his eloquence, his pathos, and his power, as well as of that fierce wrath with which he denounced cruelty and oppression all the world over, and the pitying sympathy which he always showed for the victims of tyranny and injustice, whether in France, in Ireland, in India, or in America. His mind was great, but the sympathies of his pitying soul were greater still. That mighty heart was large enough to embrace within the sphere of its unselfish love his own countrymen of every class and creed, and not merely his countrymen, but the serfs of tyranny in every land. Borne upward on the pinions of justice and mercy, he soared to sublimer heights than any of the contemporary statesmen, and especially dealt with the

great problems of religious toleration from a wider and loftier standpoint. He rose superior to the narrow views of the statesmen of his own time, to the prejudices of his own party, to the bigotry of his own University. He built the temple of religious liberty on foundations broad and deep, and he made its portals wide enough to admit his countrymen of every creed without exception or limitation. If we would realise his greatness from this point of view, let us compare him with the men of his own and of the preceding century, with Bacon or Milton, Locke or Paley or Swift. These surely are great names, the greatest in the literary history of England. They wrote eloquently of freedom, of toleration, of religious liberty. Some of them boasted that they were its special champions and apostles. But which was ready to emancipate his Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen either in England or in Ireland, even long after all danger of civil strife had passed away? Not one, if perhaps we except Paley, and Paley based his principles of toleration not so much on right and justice as on policy and expediency. No, they found delight in grinding to the earth the men whose only crime, as Burke once said in effect, was to be faithful to the ancient Church of Christendom and loyal to the hereditary devolution of the Crown. They were for maintaining their pains and penalties on these men long after the danger had passed away, and continued to the last to deny them the franchises of freeborn citizens. Not so Burke. He was always the eloquent and consistent champion of emancipation, of complete but gradual emancipation, lest he might excite disastrous outbursts of fanaticism; and to the last he was the wise and confidential adviser of the Irish Catholics in their efforts to secure emancipation—emancipation for all Catholics and Dissenters of every sect, and he was ready in carrying out this policy to sacrifice every friend most valued.

Mr. Lecky, of whom I wish to speak with all honour, complains somewhere in his many brilliant references to Burke of what he calls his strong bias to Sacerdotalism, which he thinks often gravely deflected his judgment. Well, you cannot expect me to blame Burke for this alleged bias to Sacerdotalism. But I suspect that if we substitute the word

Christianity for Sacerdotalism we shall realise what Mr. Lecky means. Burke was before all things a Christian, a sincere believer in Revelation, and not merely in the sense that he read his Bible and went to Church, but further he always sought to shape his conduct both public and private in accordance with the maxims of Christianity, and no doubt these religious principles deeply influenced his views and conduct as a statesman, an orator, and a man of letters. In that sense he had a bias to Sacerdotalism, for he believed that Christianity implies a priesthood, and that the priesthood should be a power in the State. Hence he was in favour of the union of Church and State, because he held that this union gave a moral sanction to the State, and thus gave it strength and stability which could not be otherwise acquired. He was also in favour of education based on religion. In that sense Burke, like the greatest minds of the past and present, had a bias to Sacerdotalism, which I venture to think was honourable to his head and to his heart. Again, the learned historian says this bias is shown in Burke's letters to Dr. Hussey, which we cannot regard as evincing real prescience and wisdom. Of course, Burke, was no secularist in education, and whether his letters to Dr. Hussey evinced wisdom or not they certainly evinced prescience. His foresight has been justified both positively and negatively. He believed in religious education, and being educated on religious principles himself in that school in Ballytore, which in my opinion was the foundation of his greatness, he was anxious and insisted with all the force possible, that sound religious education should be given to all others, and above all things that that impious difference of knowledge and religion should never be attempted. It was that conviction that was in his mind when he wrote those letters to Dr. Hussey. What are the facts of the case? I know them well. When Burke was in the splendour of his career no priest might be educated in Ireland. The poor boys for the priesthood had at the peril of their lives to cross the sea by stealth, and they were educated in the colleges on the Continent founded by foreign Governments, and also founded and maintained by the savings of exiled Irishmen, and we are told, and it is a pathetic story, that the

exiled soldiers of the Irish Brigade turned back from the revel of the wine-shop and gave out of their scanty earnings—their hard earned pay—to the rectors of these colleges for the support of Irish scholars to keep the Faith alive in the beloved land which they never hoped to see again. All these colleges were closed at once in the outbreak of the French Revolution. There was no college in Ireland where the priest might be educated without the licence of the Crown, and that licence was not given, and then Edmund Burke came to the Government and told them that if they were wise and just they would strive to make some provision for the education of the Irish Catholic priesthood, and that it would be dangerous and fatal, even on the lowest grounds, to leave the people without instruction in the principles of morality and order. His pleadings were effective. Mr. Pitt was moved and it was resolved to establish Maynooth College. Then Edmund Burke told Dr. Hussey, and through him told the bishops, when there was question of establishing Maynooth College, some wholesome truths that secularists and rationalists by no means liked. He told them that if they consented to allow the Protestant and official trustees in Dublin Castle of the new college to intermeddle with its teaching or discipline in religious matters the institution would no longer be a benefit, and the project would become a most mischievous one. He added the very remarkable words—"If you put your clerical education or any other part of your education under their control then you will have sold your religion for their money." We have not forgotten that saying of the wisest and the greatest and the best man of his time. We will never forget it. The Government at the time acted on his advice as to the College of Maynooth. Warned by his strong language they did not interfere in the discipline or teaching of Maynooth. The power of doing so was expressly excluded. Hence no friction ever arose on the subject between the Government and the Bishops. They did not interfere with Maynooth, and Maynooth was a success.

The Government, however, did not follow Burke's advice with regard to secular or lay education. They sought to intimidate. The Catholic Bishops of this country were

opposed to it. After a long struggle, however, they succeeded in preserving their rights, and wherever they did the system has been a success. The National system is a success, the Intermediate system is a success, and where they departed from the wise advice of Edmund Burke, and gave endowments at the sacrifice of our convictions all their schemes have come to naught. The problem still remains to be solved. We venture to think that they will never solve it if they intermeddle in any way with the religious convictions of Catholics in this matter. If they mean to solve it at all it must be done on Burke's principle of doing the Catholics full justice in the matter of endowment, but without in any way tampering with their conscience or attempting to make the endowment a bribe to induce them to sacrifice their principles. The State has a right to secure efficiency in public education, but it has no right to insist that it shall be done in a way that comes in conflict with the rights of conscience, and these rights are to be defined not by outsiders, who often have no conscience in such matters, but by those who are most concerned, and whose sacrifices have proved their sincerity. Burke throughout his whole career has been an honour to his native countrymen. We are all proud of him ; we can all join without any sacrifice of principle in doing him honour—the Churchman, the Catholic, the Presbyterian, every English-speaking man—he rendered signal services to them all. It is something that this poor country of ours has produced the greatest and most eloquent of English-speaking statesmen, one who is great not with the passing greatness of a generation, but with a greatness that will endure for ever. We owe him honour and gratitude, and in honouring Burke we honour ourselves. I hope, therefore, in proposing this resolution for the acceptance of this meeting it will meet with a cordial and unanimous acceptance.

WHAT FORCE HAVE INFORMAL WILLS IN
CONSCIENCE ?

THIS is an interesting and very practical question, which has been often asked, and not always satisfactorily answered ; and missionary priests would do well to endeavour to solve it for themselves, when occasion arises, on clear and definite principles. Yet there is considerable diversity of opinion on the subject even amongst theologians of the greatest name ; hence we venture, with some hesitation however, to offer a practical solution.

A will has been defined by the Roman lawyers to be :— “ *Voluntatis nostrae justa sententia de eo quod quis post mortem suam fieri velit ;* ” that is to say, it is the authentic expression of a man’s last wish regarding the disposal of his property after his death. The word “ *justa*,” which we have translated “ *authentic*,” may be understood either of the *legally* authentic, that is, formal will, or, in a wider sense, it may be taken to include the genuine and authentic expression of the testator’s last wish, regarding the disposal of his property, even when not executed with the legal formalities. It is in this wider sense we are to understand the word for the present.

The legal formalities required by our municipal law, as it stands at present, are very simple, although mistakes are sometimes made even in these formalities.

1. The will must be *in writing* ; except in the case of wills made “ *by mariners at sea or soldiers in actual service.*”

2. It must be *signed* by the testator, or the signature, if previously made, must be *acknowledged* by the testator as the signature of his last will and testament, in the presence of two or more witnesses present at the same time.

3. The witnesses must themselves *sign* the will in presence of the testator, and (at least for caution sake) in presence of each other.

No particular *form* of attestation is necessary, provided it appear on the face of the document that the persons signed their names as witnesses to the will. Hence the word "witnesses" before their names would be sufficient for the validity; but it is always safer to add a clause of attestation to this effect:—"Signed, published, and declared by the said A. B. as and for his last will and testament, in presence of us, present at the same time, who at his request, in his presence, and in presence of each other, have hereunto subscribed our names as witnesses."

As to the *position* of the testator's signature, by the 15 & 16 Vict. c. 24, it is enough, if "it be placed *at or after or following or under, or beside, or opposite to* the end of the will, in such a manner that it shall be apparent *on the face of the will*, that it was intended to give effect by such signature to the writing signed as the will; but this signature is not sufficient to give effect to any disposition *underneath or following* it, or inserted *after* the signature is made." ¹

Codicils must be executed with the same solemnities as the will itself; and the instrument once duly executed is revocable only by (a) *the marriage* of the testator or testatrix; or (b) by the execution of a new will of later date; ² or (c) by the burning, tearing, or other destruction of the will (*animo revocandi*) by the testator himself, or by some other person *in his presence* and by his direction. A case has been recently decided, in which the court gave effect to the dispositions of a will that was admitted to have been destroyed by order, but not in presence, of the testator.

The question now arises, if we have the authentic expression of the testator's last will, regarding the disposal of his property after his death, but legally invalid, from the non-observance of one, or more, or all, of these formalities, what force, if any, has this informal will in conscience? The greatest theologians are divided in answering this question; and in order to understand this diversity of opinion it is necessary to bear in mind that there is another question, on

¹ Stephens, Chapter XX., note page 590 (eighth edition).

² Or other instrument executed like a will, and revoking the former one.

the answer to which the solution of this mainly depends, namely—in virtue of what law has a man the right of disposing of his property after his death? We shall discuss this last question in the first place.

I. What law gives the right of disposing of property by will?

Some canonists and theologians declare that we enjoy this right by the natural law; ¹ others ² of great name derive it from the civil law, and consequently with us it would be derivable from the municipal law of these realms. Haunoldus is very strong in favour of this opinion, declaring that it is “*simpliciter vera*.” A third party takes a *via media*, and derives the right of making a will from the *jus gentium*; which is true, this far at least, that it is a right recognised and conceded by all nations that have had any pretensions to civilization. We cannot enter intimately into this discussion, first, because it is of very little practical importance; and, secondly, because we think that while apparently differing from one another, the three parties are very much in accord on the main question, at least for all practical purposes.

Regarding the first opinion it is clear that the natural law, strictly speaking, cannot give this right, and for a very obvious reason. Property is not transferred by will until a man is dead; hence a testator, whilst he is living, does not wish his property to pass from him, and when he is dead, he is incapable of dominion, and therefore of transferring it. “*Vivens non vult, et mortuus non potest, dominium transferre*.” Some *positive* law therefore is necessary to enable a man by his act, whilst living, to give effect to any disposition of his property after death.

Now this positive law cannot be the municipal law of any nation; the municipal law may restrict and regulate the exercise of this power for the public good, but it cannot abrogate it, and therefore, never granted the substantive right; and its attempted abrogation would be invalid, because fatal to the welfare and happiness of society. It

¹ Molina, Vinnius, etc.

² Haunoldus, Zallinger, Schmalzgrueber, etc.; with some restrictions however.

is therefore independent of (as far as the substantive right is concerned), and anterior to the municipal law ; its roots are fixed in the soil of society itself. When men began to form states it was found by experience that the peace of families, and the general good, required that industrious men should have this power of disposing of their property. Otherwise they should either transfer it during life, and thus reduce themselves to beggary, or a general scramble would take place for a man's goods after his death, at least when he had no definite heir to succeed him. Either alternative would be disastrous to the best interests of society, and hence we say this power of making a will is derived from the law of nations.

"Est autem hoc jus gentium minus proprie dictum ; quia ad jus gentium proprie dictum, ea duntaxat pertinent quae gentes servare tenentur inter se (international law), et quae omnium, aut fere omnium, gentium usu ad earum commune bonum et felicitatem promovendam, recepta sunt. Atque testamenti confectio, licet plerumque gentium moribus recepta sit, ipsam tamen communis boni et felicitatis promotionem, et societatis inter eas conservationem *immediate* non respicit." ¹

The power of making a will therefore is entirely conformable to the natural law ; the substantive right is directly traceable to the law of nations ; the municipal law in the public interest can regulate the conditions of its exercise, but may not wholly abrogate the right, which is derivable from a higher source. We can now discuss with greater ease the second question :—

II. How far has an informal will any binding force *in foro conscientiae* ?

It is admitted by most theologians that after the just sentence of the proper authority declaring its invalidity *in foro externo* the will can have no force in conscience. For the law requiring the observance of certain solemnities is both just and necessary, hence when the law pronounces its judgment in any particular case, the parties are bound in conscience to give effect to the sentence. The legatee under an informal will must in all cases hand over the legacies to be distributed according to law by the administrator,

¹ Schmalzgrueber. In Lib. 3, Decret. *De Test.* n. 5.

and cannot under any circumstances, when the sentence is a just one, make himself occult compensation.

The question then is not what force has the informal will *post*, but *ante sententiam*. As might be expected, the theologians give different answers to this question, according to their different notions about the nature of the will.

Those who hold that it transfers property by the natural law will consequently hold, that the instrument, informal merely by municipal law, really transfers the dominion in all cases until the law declares the contrary by its sentence.¹ Hence, if this opinion were true, even a son disinherited by an informal will would be bound to give up the property of his father to the legatee although a stranger, at least when there was an authentic instrument which he knew expressed the testator's *real* will, and had not been yet declared to be invalid by competent authority.

On the other hand, there is the opinion of those who derive the testamentary rights exclusively from the municipal law, and who naturally hold that the will, if not executed with all the formalities of the law, is nothing but waste paper, and therefore if a man is certain of its invalidity he cannot even *ante sententiam* lay any claim to any property, even in his possession, by virtue of the informal will. This opinion, although speculatively probable, is not safe in practice.

The third opinion, adopted by Suarez and St. Liguori, applies the principle, *melior est conditio possidentis*, to the holders of the goods of the deceased, until the sentence of the law is definitely pronounced.² Hence, if the heir-at-law or the representatives of the deceased are in possession, they can hold the property with a safe conscience, until the judge declares in favour of a doubtful will, and grants probate of the same. On the other hand, if the legatee should happen to be in possession or should obtain possession without fraud, or other injustice, as for instance, from the

¹ Lugo seems to hold this opinion and to permit occult compensation even *post sententiam judicis*; but he merely quotes others and in reality holds that the will is of no force even *ante sententiam*.

² This opinion is also held by Sotus, Layman, Billuart, Pirhing, Gury, Ballerini, Crolley, and several others.

executor of an informal will, he can retain the property until the will has been declared invalid, by the proper authority; and if, from any cause, the case never comes before the court, he can act as lawful owner. Neither is the legatee or executor bound to give any information to the heir-at-law, or other representative, of their own defective title, under the informal will; let the interested parties find it out for themselves. Of course in this country probate will not be granted, if the instrument is manifestly invalid on the face of the document; but sometimes probate has been granted when the will was, although apparently a valid instrument, really invalid, and known to be such by one of the parties, because, for instance, both witnesses did not sign in presence of the testator, or from some similar cause. This opinion is the safest in practice and is well founded in reason and authority,* besides having the advantage of leaving things as they are, until the law when it is invoked, settles the controversy. We suspect it is the opinion that sensible men, no matter what their speculative views, always followed in practice.

But here a very important question arises—what is meant by this informal will in virtue of which *ante sententiam* the *bona fide* possessor can hold the property, until the law declares the will invalid? Are any formalities necessary for this instrument? Must it be at least in writing, or must it also be signed by the testator and by the witnesses, so as to be apparently a valid instrument? The late learned Dr. Crolly of Maynooth, whose opinion on these questions is entitled to the greatest respect, declares very distinctly that the will, in order to have this force in conscience, must be *apparently* a valid will, and must have been regarded by the testator as valid; and he adds furthermore, that a manifestly invalid will has no force whatsoever in conscience.

"Suppono testatorem putasse testamentum minus solemne ratum et validum esse; quia si ipse scienter testamentum fecerit quod in foro civili nullum et irritum esse cognoverit, hoc nullo modo testamentum dici potest, etc." *De Contr.* n. 388. And again, n. 389. "Puto testamentum manifesto irritum nullam vim habere, ne in foro quidem conscientiae, *quia* praescripta, quibus observatis, testamentum, prima facie in foro civili ratum esse censebitur sunt *simplicissima*."

With this very clear and emphatic opinion we are sorry to say we cannot agree. We venture to think that the principle, *melior est conditio possidentis*, applies not only to the apparently valid will, but to every *authentic* expression of the last will of the testator regarding the disposal of his property after his death. By *authentic* we mean, not only that it is the genuine expression, but also that it is capable of satisfactory proof; otherwise there would be no security against fraud. And it must be the expression of the absolute, ultimate, and efficacious will of the testator, not the mere expression of a future purpose, or conditional desire, not a *vellem* but a present *volo* to which he wishes, as far as he can, to give effect. We think an informal will, in this sense of the word, need not be an apparently valid instrument nor signed by either the testator or the witnesses, nor reduced to writing at all, provided it is otherwise capable of proof. The reason is because, as we have seen, the will really derives its power of transferring property from the *jus gentium*; now the *jus gentium* requires no particular solemnities beyond the authentic expression of the testator's wish. This is sufficiently evident from the great variety of legal solemnities employed at different times and in different places. The civil law required for a *testamentum clausum*, or written will, no less than seven male witnesses of the age of puberty, summoned for the purpose; and required moreover, that the testator subscribe the will in his own handwriting, or if not, that an eighth witness subscribe the name in his stead and that all the other witnesses should afterwards subscribe *per se* or *per alios*. Yet for a *nuncupative* will the civil law only required seven legal witnesses to *hear* the testator declare his intentions by *word of mouth*, or assert that the written document was his will.

The canon law only requires the parish priest and two or more witnesses to the testator's *verbal* declaration, in order to make it a valid will, and even our municipal law in the case of soldiers and sailors, admits the validity of a verbal will. The *jus gentium* therefore never required writing as a necessary condition of validity, but the laws of all nations required satisfactory proof of some kind regarding

the disposition of the testator's property. It is not because the *volo* was expressed in writing, or signed by the testator or by others that it acquired, *jure gentium*, the power of transferring property, but because it was the genuine wish of the testator and provable as such. This may be illustrated by a case that actually occurred.

A dying man, after receiving the last sacraments, emphatically expressed his will in the presence of the priest and several other persons, to leave his house and land to his illegitimate daughter, then married and living in the house. He was advised, for caution sake, to get a will duly made and executed to that effect, and actually sent for a clerk to write the will, but before his arrival the man became unconscious and died. The brother of the deceased was his heir-at-law, and, hearing that a will was made, at first took no steps to recover the property; but when he learned the truth, he at once took steps to eject the niece and her husband and family. Now was not the woman in conscience justified in remaining in the possession of the house and land as long as the law allowed her? And if her uncle had never learned the truth regarding the will, we think she could, with a safe conscience, continue in the enjoyment thereof. Many similar cases might be made, in which the making of a formal will is omitted from ignorance, or from negligence, or from inability to have it made and executed in time; and yet in these cases we may have an authentic declaration of the genuine, absolute, efficacious *volo* of the testator. Whenever there is satisfactory proof of this will in the sense explained, we are decidedly of opinion that St. Liguori's principle applies and that the parties in possession can, with a safe conscience, retain possession until the law decides against them.

It has been said that if there were a real genuine *volo* in the sense explained, the testator would take care to make a legal will. This, however, is by no means always the case. Like many other things, making a legal will is neglected until it is too late; the consequence is that there is no will of any kind, or some informal will is unduly executed, even when the testator is most anxious to have a formal will.

The reason assigned in the paragraph quoted above is,

that a manifestly informal will should have no force in conscience, as the requirements of the law are *so simple*. They have not always been so simple, and they are not now so very simple for rude, ignorant people, many of whom cannot write at all, and very few of whom know how to make a valid will, simple as it is. Besides, the records of the law courts made it abundantly clear that, even in point of form, very intelligent people sometimes make grave mistakes in this matter, so that the lawyers have good grounds for toasting the memories of those who undertake to make their own wills. But really this is not the question, whether it is easy or difficult to make a valid will, but whether, by the law of nations, a will transfers property because it is a written document, or because it is the genuine expression of the testator's wish? We think the latter is the true reason. When all the legal formalities are not exactly complied with, the instrument can have no force in virtue of municipal law; whatever force it has is derived from the natural law, or from the law of nations, and, in regard to either one or the other, it is quite immaterial whether the will of the testator be written or not, provided it is genuine and provable. The natural law, or the law of nations, never required writing as an indispensable condition for ascertaining either one or the other of these points.

We therefore think an informal will has this force in conscience, that a legatee under the will can lawfully acquire or retain possession of his legacy, when no unjust means are resorted to, until the judge declares the will to be invalid; on the other hand, the representative of the deceased is not bound to yield possession of the goods to the executor or legatees until the will is proven to be valid, at least when he has any reasonable ground to question its validity. And by an informal will we mean the authentic expression of the genuine, ultimate, and absolute wish of the testator regarding the disposal of his property, whether destitute of any or all of the requisite legal formalities.

A FAMILY OF FAMOUS CELTIC SCHOLARS.

ON the eastern shore of the Bay of Killala, about ten miles north of Ballina, are the ruins of the old castle of Leacan. The site was well chosen, for it was to be the home, not of warriors, but of scholars, and so they built their stronghold in the hearing of the sea, fronting the gales from the west where they could see from the windows the fierce Atlantic billows spend their wintry rage against the bleak cliffs of Benmore. And many a fearful scene of shipwreck they must have witnessed, when the dismantled vessels flying from the outer gales were forced to seek the inhospitable shelter of Killala Bay, for a dangerous bar stretches across its mouth, and when the rising tide swept up the estuary in the teeth of the south-west wind and the Moy's full current, small chance of escape remained for the doomed ship, if she got amongst the breakers that barely covered the treacherous shoals.

Yet for the Celtic scholar that old castle of Leacan is classic ground. It was the home of a family of learned Irishmen who, with the single exception of the O'Clerys, have done more for Celtic literature than any other race of our ancient hereditary ollaves. We propose in this paper to give a short sketch of the Clan Firis of Leacan, and of their literary labours in the cause of Irish history and archæology.

The Clan Firis came of an illustrious stock, for they trace their descent to Dathi, the last pagan king of Ireland, who is said to have been killed by lightning at the foot of the Alps. Awley, his son, a prop in battle, brought home the body of the arch-chieftain through battles and marches by land and by sea, and buried him with his fathers at Cruachan of the Kings where the tall red pillar-stone still marks the hero's grave. The original seat of the family was in Magh Broin between Lough Conn and the river Moy—a district that was then, and is still known as the “Two Bacs.” Gilla'Iosa Mor Mac Firis describes

it in his topographical poem as a sweet and fertile land where the crops grew quick and rich ; it was embosomed in delightful woods, the seat of poets, who loved to wander in their shade and compose their songs for feasts and battle. The Clan Firis dwelt near the margin of the lake to the east as well as on the opposite side in fair Glen Nephin, where the scarlet hazel dipped its hundred tendrils into the lake's pellucid waters.

It was probably the advance of the English settlers towards the close of the thirteenth century that drove the Clan Firis from their beloved homes around the lake somewhat further to the north at Rosserk, which was the extreme limit of their ancient territory. This place was originally called Ros Searce, the *ros*, or wooded promontory of the Virgin Searc, whose church was built thereon. The primitive edifice of the virgin saint has disappeared, but its site is occupied by the ruins of a small but very beautiful abbey, which John O'Donovan thought was built about five centuries ago. He was nearly right, for Father Mooney, the Franciscan Chronicler, tells us that " Rosserk was founded in the fifteenth century by a chieftain of the Joyces, a powerful family of Welsh extraction, remarkable (as they are still) for their gigantic stature, who settled in West Connaught in the thirteenth century."

The site was certainly well chosen on a promontory running into the river Moy, " the stream of speckled salmons." A graceful square-built tower of bluish stone, as in most of the Franciscan churches, surmounted the centre of the sacred edifice, which sees itself reflected in the waters of the river, and commands a magnificent prospect of all the surrounding country—the dark irregular range of the Ox mountains to the east, to the south-west Nephin's stately form throwing at evening its shadow over the waters of Lough Conn, while far to the north the eye wanders over river, and bay, and swelling waves, and frowning cliffs, out to the boundless blue of the Atlantic. The Clan Firis are described by Gilla Iosa Mor MacFiris in 1418¹ as poets of Hy Amhlagaidh (Awley) of Rosserk. Whence we may conclude that in the beginning of the fifteenth century the family had already left Magh Broin

¹ *Hy Fiachrach*, page 237.

and were then established at the old abbey on the western bank of the Moy just where the river begins to widen to an estuary. How long they remained here cannot be exactly determined. Probably the Joyces who founded the Franciscan abbey in the fifteenth century drove them across the river, for the Welsh giants were men of war and blood who knew no law but force. But then if they expelled Clan Firis they brought in the Franciscans and built them that beautiful abbey of Rosserk, and endowed it with a share of the lands plundered from the harmless bards and ollaves of Tirawley. True, indeed, the western shore of the river was fertile and "quick-growing," whilst the eastern shore towards the sea was bleak and bare ; but it was good enough for the mere Irish, and they ought to be thankful that the strong-handed Welshmen of Tirawley, the Barrets, Lynotts, and Joyces, left them so much of their ancient inheritance ! A worse day was to come when both victors and vanquished were overwhelmed in a common ruin, and the troopers of Cromwell became lords of all. Yet although the O'Dowd himself, by ancient right the ruler of these territories, was robbed of all his lands in Tirawley, and henceforward confined to Tireragh, he gave a new grant to the hereditary historians of his family, not so fertile or so wide indeed as their ancient inheritance, but large enough to maintain them in competence and with a dignity becoming their high office. Here it was by the shore of the bay that "the brothers Ciothruadh and James, sons of Diarmaid Caoch MacFiris, aided by their cousin John Og, the son of William, built the castle of Leacan MacFiris, in the year of the age of Christ, 1560." ¹ And there it was they wrote books of history, annals, and poetry ; and moreover kept a school of history long before that castle was built. So the family must have crossed the Moy from Rosserk many years before 1500, and established themselves at Leacan, although the great stone castle was not built for their protection down to the stormy period at which Elizabeth commenced her reign. Here it seems they continued to reside until the Cromwellian settlement. Then the Castle of Leacan came within the mile line of territory all round the province of Connaught, which

¹ *Hy Fiachrach*, page 167.

was planted by Cromwellians in order to deprive the natives of all access to the sea. And so Duaid MacFirbis, the last and greatest scholar of that ancient race, was driven from his ancestral home, his lands were confiscated, and he himself became a wanderer and a beggar depending for his daily bread on the bounty of the stranger. When he was an old man bowed down with the weight of eighty years, he was one night stopping in a wayside inn at Dunflin, in the parish of Screen, County Sligo. A young gentleman of the name of Crofton, one of a family enriched by the plunder of the old Irish proprietors, came into the shop and began to take some improper freedoms with a young girl behind the counter. She tried to stop his advances by pointing to the old gentleman in the inner parlour, who, perhaps, overheard what was taking place, and uttered some remonstrance. Thereupon the licentious savage seized a large knife, and, rushing at the old man, stabbed him to the heart. And so the last of our great Irish scholars was foully murdered in cold blood by a young *gentleman* of the County Sligo.

The Clan Firbis were for many centuries at once bards, brehons, and historians to their kinsmen the O'Dowds, the hereditary princes of Tireragh and Tirawley. In this capacity they held large freehold estates, they exercised considerable power, and discharged various functions. As hereditary historians they kept an accurate and faithful record of the descent and sub-divisions of the various families, of the territories assigned to each, the privileges which they claimed, as well as the charges to which they were liable. They were present in the battles of the clans to be witnesses of the prowess of the chiefs; they sang the praises of the victors, and recorded the names and deeds of those who had fallen on the field. These songs they chanted at the banquet of the chiefs when the field was won, and stimulated the clansmen to battle by recounting the great deeds of their ancestors and the wrongs inflicted by the enemy which it was their duty to avenge.

Then when family disputes arose, or private wrongs were to be remedied, it was the duty of the annalist to divide and limit the territory of each family, for he alone had the custody of the

records that fixed their titles, and he alone was sufficiently trained in the complex code of the Brehon Law to fix the eric or compensation for the wrong done.

Moreover, at the inauguration of the O'Dowd, MacFirbis always played an important part. The Irish sub-kings were solemnly inaugurated on the summit of some green hill under the open sky, with the principal chiefs, and the clergy, and the people assembled round them about. This ceremony, in the case of the O'Dowd, generally took place on Carn-Amhalgaith,¹ which is supposed to be the hill of Mullagh-carn, not far from Killala, on the western bank of the Moy. We have an account of this most interesting ceremony written by one of the Clan Firbis.

First of all, it seems, when the chiefs and the coarbs of the principal churches and all the people had selected their future ruler, who was that member of the royal family best qualified in their estimation for the office, MacFirbis read for the prince elect a summary of his duties and privileges as contained in the interesting work called the *Institutions of a King—Teagusc Righ*—of which a manuscript copy still exists.² According to O'Sullivan Beare³ the prince elect was then required to swear that he would observe these ordinances, and, above all, that he would preserve the rights and liberties of the Church, and if necessary, shed his blood in its defence. Mass was then celebrated, and the white wand of inauguration was solemnly blessed.

It was the high privilege of MacFirbis to bring the body of this white wand over the head of the new prince, who stood with sword ungirt, then to present it to him, as the symbol of kingly authority, and solemnly salute him by name as The O'Dowd. O'Caomhain, the representative of the senior family of the tribe, next pronounced the name, and after him all the coarbs, and all the chiefs pronounced the same name and offered their homage to the new ruler. The people then took up the name in one loud shout of approval, and the white rod was broken to signify that all authority thenceforward centred in the O'Dowd. This white rod was the

¹ See *Hy Fiachrach*, page 439.

² Library of Trinity College, H. 1. 17.

³ *Historia Cath.*

symbol of authority from the most ancient times ; its whiteness and straightness were the emblems of the purity, truth, and rectitude of the ruler. A sword would imply the power of life and death, but the rod signified that the ruler meant to govern his people as a father does his children, and that they would be so docile and obedient that the ruler would need no other weapon to govern them. The prince elect had previously put off his sword and cloak to give greater significance to this ceremony. Sometimes, too, one of the sub-chiefs put off his sandals in token of obedience, and threw a slipper over the head of the new chief for good luck, but these ceremonies were not everywhere observed. Lastly, the new chief turned round three times backwards and forwards in honour of the Holy Trinity, looking out over his territory and his people, as their divinely chosen father and protector, and then the ceremony was complete.

Of course a banquet followed—drink and feasting and song. The privilege of first drinking at this royal feast was given by The O'Dowd to O'Caomhain, the senior representative of the tribe, but O'Caomhain might not taste the cup until he had first given it to the poet MacFirbis to drink, where he sat at the right hand of his king. Moreover, O'Dowd gave to O'Caomhain the weapons, battle-dress, and steed, which he was wont to use before ; and O'Caomhain in turn presented his own battle-harness to MacFirbis the poet.

As might be expected, Clan Firbis produced several distinguished scholars who have rendered most important services to our Celtic literature. The references to the family in ancient times are few and brief, for with very striking modesty these great annalists make little reference to themselves. From other sources, however, as well as from incidental references in their own books, we gather the following summary of their literary history.

The earliest reference dates from A.D. 1279, when, according to the Four Masters, Gilla Iosa Mor MacFirbis, ollave of Tireragh, died. Gilla Iosa—servant of Jesus—and Gilla Iosa Mor, were favourite names with the MacFirbis family, and show that their learning was inspired and elevated by a truly Christian spirit. He was succeeded by another

Gilla Iosa MacFirbis, probably his son, whose death is assigned to 1301, and who is described in the quaint language of the translators of the old annals of Clonmacnoise, "as chief chronicler of Tyrefeaghrach, wonderful well-skilled in histories, poetry, computation, and many other sciences." This wonderful scholar was succeeded in his office by Donnach MacFirbis, who died in 1376, and who is described in more moderate language as a "good historian." This Donnach was one of the compilers of the great work called the *Yellow Book of Leacan* to which we shall presently refer. Three years later, in 1379, they record the death of Firbis MacFirbis, a "learned historian" who no doubt also aided in the compilation of the same great work, although no special mention is made of his name. Then in 1417 we have recorded the death of another Gilla Iosa Mor Firbis, the son of the above named Donnach, who according to Duald MacFirbis, was "chief historian to O'Dowd of Tireragh, and composed a long topographical poem on the tribes and districts in the ancient territories of his ancestors." This is the work which, under the title of *Hy Fiachrach*, has been most ably edited by John O'Donovan, and published by the Irish Archæological Society in 1844.

Several members of the family, too, became ecclesiastics, and under the date of 1450, Archdale tells us that "Eugene O Cormyn and Thady MacFirbis, eremites of the order of St. Augustine, received a grant of the lands of Storma in Tirawley from Thady O'Dowd, to erect a monastery thereon under the invocation of the Holy Trinity; the Pope, Nicholas V., confirmed the same by a Bull dated the 12th of December, 1454." Then we have the entry of the erection of Leacan Castle in 1560, to which we have already referred. But the following year a great calamity befell Ciothruadh, the principal builder of the castle, for the *Annals of Lough Cé* tells us that "Naisse, the son of (probably this) Ciothruadh, the most eminent musician that was in Erin, was drowned in Lough Gill, near Sligo—and also his wife, the daughter of M'Donogh, with some other," who likely accompanied them in the same boat.

Fortunately for our Celtic literature and history, many of

the great works composed by the Clan Firis still survive, although not yet published.

First of all we have the great compilation called the *Yellow Book of Leacan*—*Leabhar Buidhe Lecain*—preserved in Trinity College Library, and classed H. 2. 16. This immense work contains some 500 pages of vellum manuscript, and was not composed, but rather transcribed from existing materials so early as 1390, by Donnach and Gilla Iosa MacFiris to whom we have already referred. O'Curry tells us in his "Lectures" that it begins in its present condition with a collection of family and political poems mostly referring to the great Connaught septs—the O'Kellys, O'Connors, etc., etc., as well as to the O'Donnells of Donegal, who were neighbours of Tir Fiachrach in the north—the ancient boundary between the two tribes being the Codhnaigh river which flows into the sea close to Columcille's monastery at Drumcliff, under the shadow of Benbulbin, four miles to the north of Sligo. O'Curry says, however, that these pieces formed no part of the original work. Then we have some early monastic rules of great interest for the ecclesiastical historian written in verse—some of which have been published in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 1864-66, from copies made by O'Curry himself. These are followed by a great variety of legendary and historical pieces, like the battle of Magh Rath (Moyra) and the voyages of Maelduin in the Atlantic Ocean, which it is unnecessary to particularise here, but which are exceedingly valuable for the topographical and historical information which they contain. Some of these tracts have been already published, but several, almost equally valuable, still remain in manuscript.

The second great work which we owe to the Clan Firis is the *Book of Leacan*, a distinct compilation, composed some 26 years later, and mostly in the handwriting of Gilla Iosa Mor MacFiris. It is a still larger work, containing more than 600 pages of fine vellum manuscript, but its contents, though highly valuable, are almost identical with the contents of the famous *Book of Ballymote*, from which it was probably copied, at least in part. The most original and therefore the most valuable tract in the entire work is that to which we have

already referred to as the *Tribes and Customs of Hy Fiachrach* published by the Irish Archaeological Society. These two great works sufficiently prove that the historians of Tirawley must have had a perfect acquaintance with our entire Celtic literature, and were indeed wonderfully well skilled "in histories, poetry, computation, and many other sciences."

Next we have the writings of Duald MacFirbis, the most learned and the most unfortunate of his name and race. His entire life was a chronicle of woe for himself, for his family, for his religion, and for his country.

Duald MacFirbis (Dubhaltach) was the son of another Gilla Iosa Mor, and was born at his father's castle of Leacan Mac Firbis about the year 1580. If, as O'Curry tells us, he went to the south of Ireland to study so early as 1595, he must have been at least fifteen years old at that time. The latter was the year in which O'Donnell made a fierce raid from Donegal on Southern Connaught, burning and pillaging all before him. The schools of Thomond were at this period very famous, and attracted native scholars from all parts of Ireland. The MacEgans of Redwood Castle in Lower Ormond were the most famous Brehon lawyers in Ireland, and here young MacFirbis came to perfect himself in the study of Celtic jurisprudence. The O'Davorens of Burren, county Clare, had also a famous school of law and poetry, and MacFirbis spent some time there also, so that he neglected no opportunities of mental culture, which could render him better qualified to discharge the high functions of hereditary ollave in his native territory. That he profited to the full by these opportunities is abundantly manifest from his writings. Not only was he a distinguished Irish scholar and antiquarian, but he was also familiar with the Latin and English languages, and what is more extraordinary still, and furnishes a striking proof of the excellence of our Celtic schools even at that unhappy period, he was very well acquainted with Greek also. For in his copy of Cormac's Glossary in Trinity College, Dublin, MacFirbis explains the meaning of several of the Irish terms by giving in the margin the Latin and frequently the Greek equivalents, written, too, in Greek characters, and with an accuracy and freedom which prove that beyond doubt the writer must have not

only understood Greek but was well able to write that language ?

It was probably in the school annexed to the Collegiate Church of St. Nicholas, in Galway, that MacFirbis acquired his familiarity, such as it was, with the English and classical languages. Certainly very little English was spoken on the banks of the Moy about the year 1590, for the Welsh and Norman invaders of Tirawley had become more Irish than the Irish themselves in customs, dress, and language. But Galway always continued to be an English city ; English was always spoken, although not perhaps exclusively by the citizens ; and the writings of Lynch and O'Flaherty prove that beyond doubt the study of the classical languages was cultivated with a high degree of success in the City of the Tribes.

At any rate MacFirbis himself tells us that it was in the College of St. Nicholas, Galway, about the year 1650, " during the religious war between the Catholics of Ireland and the heretics of Ireland, Scotland, and England," that he composed his great work on " The Branches of Relationship and the Genealogical Ramifications of every colony that took possession of Erin traced from this time up to Adam . . . together with a Sanctilogium, and catalogue of the Monarchs of Erin ; and finally an Index which comprises in alphabetical order the surnames and the remarkable places mentioned in this book which was compiled by Dubhaltach MacFirbis of Leacan, 1650." " And the cause of writing the books," adds the pious author, " is to increase the glory of God, and for the information of people in general." In those evil days of Ireland, it was not love of fame or gain that inspired her scholars to transmit to posterity the history of their bleeding country—it was the nobler purpose of God's glory, and the instruction of their countrymen in the better days that yet might dawn on their native land.

The autograph of this splendid compilation is in the possession of the Earl of Roden, and a copy made by O'Curry is in the Royal Irish Academy. It is a most valuable repertory of the highest authority on all those subjects of which it treats, and has been universally recognised as such by our ablest

Irish scholars.¹ In 1666 MacFirbis drew up an abstract of his larger work including some additional pedigrees, of which work O'Donovan tells us there were two copies to be had, although he himself had seen neither of them.

MacFirbis compiled two other most valuable works, no copies of which are now known to be extant, one a Glossary of the Ancient Laws of Erin, the loss of which is irreparable, and also a Biographical Dictionary of the writers and distinguished scholars of ancient Erin, "of which," says O'Curry, "unfortunately not even a fragment has yet been discovered."

Historian and lawyer as he was by virtue of his office, MacFirbis was also a poet, and O'Curry tells that he himself had in his possession two poems of considerable pretension written by MacFirbis, in praise of his patrons the O'Shaughnessys of Gort, who were sprung from the same stock as MacFirbis himself. He was also the author of a collection of Annals which are quoted by his patron and friend, Sir James Ware, but which are not now known to exist.

We have, however, a most valuable summary of our Annals distinct from the former work compiled by MacFirbis, and lately published in the series of the Master of the Rolls. It is known well to students of Irish History as the *Chronicon Scotorum*, a work of great value for its historical accuracy. The author apologises for its meagre character, and tells us that it is merely an abstract, or compendium of the history of the Scots, omitting all lengthened details. Still it is of great value and contains several novel scraps of important historical information. In its present form it only comes down to the year 1135, and unfortunately even in that period a large deficiency occurs from 722 to 805.

The life of Duaid MacFirbis corresponds with the most calamitous period of Ireland's chequered history. When he was yet a boy he heard of the disastrous defeat at Kinsale, in 1601. The Flight of the Earls and the confiscation of Ulster followed a few years later, about the time when he had arrived at man's estate. He doubtless shared in the bright hopes that the Confederation of 1641 inspired in the breasts

¹ See Dr. Petrie's Paper in Vol. XVIII. of the *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*.

of his countrymen ; but he saw all these bright promises fade away before the breath of the angel of discord. He saw Cromwell's fiery sword over the land, and the persecuted Catholics, who had hoped so much from the Restoration again doomed to disappointment by the perfidy of the faithless Stuarts.

There is no sadder chapter in literary history than that which tells the fate of this old man in his declining years. To his honour be it for ever remembered, Sir James Ware, to whom Irish literature owes so much, was, while he lived, the patron and friend of MacFibris. He received him into his own house in Dublin ; he employed him in the work which he loved—translating and elucidating the old manuscripts of his forefathers. But that noble knight, as MacFibris justly calls him, died in 1666, and once more the old man became a pauper and an outcast. He dare not remain in Dublin without a friend to protect him, for he would be persecuted as a Catholic, and perhaps persecuted as a scholar. So like every hunted animal, he strove to reach his old home again, and travelled all the long rugged road from Dublin city to the banks of Moy. But the stranger was in the home of his fathers, and the friends of his youth were like himself persecuted paupers ; even O'Dowd, the chieftain of his race, was without lands and without castles. For a few years more the venerable scholar lived on amidst the scenes of his childhood a broken-down old man, until, as Eugene O'Curry thinks, when striving to make his way on foot to Dublin to visit the son of Sir James Ware, he met his tragic fate in a wayside inn at the hands of a savage and licentious youth.

Yet, in spite of poverty and persecution during all these disastrous years, MacFibris devoted his best energies to the preservation and illustration of his country's history, “ for the glory of God, and the instruction of his countrymen in future years.” May you rest in peace, faithful son of unhappy Ireland, and in the better days that are dawning upon us, we may hope that your countrymen will tenderly remember the name of MacFibris, and look with reverence on the ruined walls of Leacan Castle.

CARDINAL NEWMAN ON THE INSPIRATION OF
SCRIPTURE.—No. I.

IN the January number of the *Nineteenth Century* there is an article on "The Inspiration of Scripture," written by Cardinal Newman, which has attracted a very considerable share of attention, both amongst Catholics and non-Catholics. The Cardinal's high position in the Church, his literary fame, and his well known love of truth, not unnaturally lend great importance to everything he writes, especially on religious questions. His smallest word is received with respect, and listened to with attention, and of course the interest is intensified a hundred-fold when he deals with the momentous theme of the Inspiration of Scripture, and makes statements that are certainly calculated to startle even the veterans of the theological schools. We need no apology, therefore, for calling the attention of our readers¹ to the Cardinal's views on this most important subject.

It is well to observe and to remember that the Cardinal himself expressly says, "my statements are simply my own, and involve no responsibility of anyone besides myself." At the end of the article, too, with genuine filial obedience and in the spirit of a true Catholic, he unreservedly submits whatever he has written to the judgment of the Holy See. Moreover, as he says, his statements are more of a tentative than dogmatic character; he "is more anxious that the question should be satisfactorily answered, than that my own answer should prove to be in every respect the right one." A prince of the Church who writes in this spirit deserves to be treated with the greatest consideration; and we trust that in our observations we shall not say a single word inconsistent with the affectionate reverence in which, in common with all the Roman Catholics of these kingdoms, we hold his Eminence Cardinal Newman.

¹ This article appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for March, 1884.

The question which he proposes for consideration is whether, as alleged by Renan and others, "it is an *undoubted fact* that the Church does *insist* on her children's acceptance of certain Scripture informations on matters of fact, in defiance of criticism and history." Many persons would probably object to the assumption implied in this question, that there are Scripture informations on any matters of fact which are in defiance of *genuine* criticism and *true* history. Hence, we think it is safer, and more satisfactory from a logical point of view, as being less open to the charge of undue assumption, to accept the statement of the question at issue as it is formulated a little lower down in No. 8: "Now, then, the main question before us being what it is that a Catholic is free to hold about Scripture in general, or about its separate portions or its statements, without compromising his firm inward assent to the dogmas of the Church, that is, to the *de fide* enunciations of Pope and Councils, we have first of all to inquire how many and what these dogmas are." Then the writer goes on to say that there are two such dogmas; one relates to the authority of Scripture, or, as we should say, its inspiration, the other to its interpretation.

With regard to the Cardinal's views on the interpretation of Scripture, we have nothing to say; he merely expresses the common teaching of theologians on this point. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves to the first question which he discusses—the authority or inspiration of Sacred Scripture.

In answer to his own question on this point—what is *de fide* with regard to the inspiration of Scripture? his reply is, "as to the authority of Scripture, we hold it to be, in all matters of faith and morals, divinely inspired throughout." In No. 11 he tells us that the Councils of Trent and the Vatican "specify 'faith and moral conduct' as the 'drift' of that teaching (in Scripture) which has the guarantee of inspiration." In No. 12 he says that the Vatican Council pronounces that supernatural Revelation consists "in rebus divinis," and is *contained*—the italics are not ours—"in libris scriptis et sine scriptis traditionibus." And finally, in No. 13, he asserts that while the Councils, as

has been shown, lay down so emphatically the inspiration of Scripture in respect to "faith and morals," it is remarkable that they do not say a word directly as to its inspiration in "matters of fact;" and hence he raises the question—but does not answer it—whether there may not be in Scripture as there are in the dogmatic utterances of Popes and Councils, *obiter dicta*, "unimportant 'statements of fact,' not inspired, and therefore unauthoritative" (No. 26), and, we may add, not even necessarily true.

The merest tyro in the schools of Catholic theology will at once perceive the startling character of these statements, and the pregnant consequences which they involve. Hence we propose to examine them very briefly, in order to ascertain if the *de fide* utterances of the Church on this matter of the inspiration of the sacred volume are exactly of the character described by Cardinal Newman; and we shall for the most part confine ourselves to an analysis of these dogmatic utterances themselves.

Of course, when the Cardinal says it is *de fide* that Scripture, in all matters of faith and morals, is divinely inspired throughout, he says what is true; but he certainly seems to imply that it is not *de fide* that Scripture is inspired in those things (if there be any such) which are not "matters of faith and morals." Now, here precisely we join issue, and we say that, in our opinion, the Catholic dogma, as defined both in the Council of Trent and the Vatican, admits of no such restricting clause; that it is adequately and accurately expressed only by eliminating that clause; or, in other words, the Catholic dogma is, to borrow some of the Cardinal's own words, that Sacred Scripture is divinely inspired *throughout*.

The Council of Trent first enumerates the books that constitute the canon of Scripture, and then, in the strictest language formulates its decree in the following words:—"Si quis autem libros ipsos *integros cum omnibus suis partibus*, prout in ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri vulgata latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, et traditiones prædictas sciens et prudens contempserit, anathema sit."¹ There is here no restriction

¹ Quarta Sessio, Decr. *De Canonicis Scripturis*

of inspiration or canonicity to matters of faith and morals ; the *entire* books, with *all their parts*, are declared to be sacred and canonical, that is, inspired Scripture, recognised as such by the Church ; for, as we shall see, that is the meaning of sacred and canonical, as applied by the Council of Trent and of the Vatican to the books of Scripture. If we take the expression “entire books, with all their parts,” to be equivalent to the Cardinal’s word *throughout* we have a right to conclude that the Catholic dogma, as enunciated in that canon, proclaims that these canonical books are inspired *throughout*, and therefore not merely in questions of faith and morals.

Lest there might be any doubt of the meaning of the expression “pro sacris et canonicis,” we beg to append the analogous canon in the Vatican Council, which, in our opinion, leaves no doubt about the matter. Here it is :—“Si quis Sacrae Scripturae libros integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout illos Sancta Tridentina Synodus recensuit, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, aut eos divinitus inspiratos esse negaverit, anathema sit.” (Can. 4, *De Revelatione*.) It is impossible to enunciate in clearer language the great Catholic truth, that the *entire* books of Sacred Scripture, *with all their parts*, are divinely inspired ; or in other words, that the books of Sacred Scripture are inspired *throughout*. If any one should urge that perhaps “eos,” in the last clause of this canon, is not necessarily the exact equivalent of the subject of the preceding clause, our answer is, that both grammatically and logically “eos” and “illos” stand for the subject of the preceding clause, and are therefore exactly co-extensive with it. At any rate, the Council pronounces the *entire* books—eos, scilicet, libros *integros*—to be inspired, without making any distinction between “matters of fact” and “matters of faith and morals,” and that is quite enough for our argument.

Everyone trained in theological discipline knows that it is not always easy to ascertain, from the wording in the body of a dogmatic chapter of a General Council, what is strictly and exactly *de fide*. But when a Council wishes to express Catholic dogma with the utmost accuracy and exactness, it

formulates it as a canon, and pronounces anathema against the gainsayers. We have a right, therefore, to infer from this canon, as a Catholic dogma, that Sacred Scripture, without exception or restriction, is inspired throughout.

Cardinal Newman says that the dogmatic phrase used by the Councils of Florence and Trent to denote the inspiration of Scripture, viz., that one and the same God was the author of both Testaments—*Deus unus et idem utriusque Testamenti auctor*—left some room for holding that the word “Testament” might mean Dispensation, rather than the Books of the Testaments, although he admits that the Vatican Council has settled the question by inserting the word “books.”

It appears to us that the Council of Florence left no doubt about the matter, for it has explained the meaning of the word “Testament” in its decree, as may be seen in so common a book as Franzelin (*De Inspir. S. Scrip.* Thesis. II., No. 1.) Here are the words :—

“Firmissime credit, profitetur et praedicat (Sacrosancta Rom. Ecclesia) unum verum Deum Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum creatorem, . . . Unum atque eundem Deum Veteris et Novi Testamenti, hoc est, Legis et Prophetarum atque Evangelii profitetur Auctorem, quoniam eodem Spiritu Sancto inspirante utriusque Testamenti sancti locuti sunt, quorum libros suscipit et veneratur, qui titulis sequentibus continentur.”

Surely the expression “Old and New Testament,” when explained to mean “the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel,” can mean nothing else but the Sacred Books that commonly go under these names.

But if there could be any doubt about the matter it would be removed by the reason that is subjoined—God is the author of the Law, the Prophets and the Gospel, *because it* was under the inspiration of His Holy Spirit that the saints of both Testaments *spoke*, whose *books*, therefore, the Council receives and venerates. The word “*locuti*” evidently refers to the *written word*, as in 2 Peter i., 21, and, in conjunction with *libros*, clearly shows that by Testament the Council meant the *books* of the Old and New Testament—that is, as it explains, the Law, the Prophets and the Gospel.

It is difficult to see how this explanation given by the Council itself can be reconciled with the statement that

the Councils of Florence and Trent left the meaning of the word Testament in the phrase referred to somewhat doubtful. The Council of Florence certainly did not ; and, Pallavicini, tells us the Council of Trent in framing its decree was careful to follow the very words of the Council of Florence.¹

It is defined both by the Council of Trent and of Florence, that God is the *auctor utriusque Testamenti*, and as we have just seen, that is the same as to say he is the *author* of all the books of the Old and New Testament ; and so it has been expressly defined by the Vatican Council, as the Cardinal himself admits. But, he says, the Latin word *auctor* still leaves some ambiguity, for it is not equivalent to the English word *author*. That may be very true, when there is a question of the words *auctor* and *author* in their generic sense ; it is too delicate a point for us to discuss, and it is quite unnecessary to discuss it. For there is no question now of the *generic* meaning of these terms, but of their *specific* meaning, which, as Cardinal Franzelin clearly points out (Thesis III., No. I.) is determined by the context, that is, by the special efficiency of which there is question. Generically, both in English and Latin, "author" means the person who gives origin or authority to anything, but in its specific sense the meaning will very much depend on the kind of origin or authority of which there is question. The same man may be the author of a law, the author of a book, and the author of a crime, but in very different senses. Now it is *de fide* that God is the author of the Books of the Old and New Testament, and will the Cardinal undertake to say, that when thus used in regard to books, *auctor* in classical Latin is not equivalent to "author" when said in reference to books in English ? We do not pretend to the Cardinal's knowledge of classical Latin, but we know something of ecclesiastical Latin, as used by the Councils of Trent and Florence, and we are quite sure that *auctor libri* in ecclesiastical Latin is pretty much the same as the "author of a book" in English.

It is *de fide*, therefore, that God is the author of all the Books of the Old and New Testament ; and we have seen that

¹ *Hist. Concil. Trid.* Lib. v., c. 11, n. 11-14.

it is *de fide* that they are inspired throughout, whole and entire, without any distinction between "matters of fact" and "matters of faith and morals." Well, now, in No. 11, the Cardinal asks—in what respect are the Canonical Books inspired? "It cannot be in every respect," he says, "except we are bound *de fide* to believe that 'terra in aeternum stat,' that heaven is above us, and that there are no antipodes." If by "respect" is meant every signification which a word or phrase might have, scientific or popular, literal or metaphorical, he is evidently right; but then it is hardly necessary to tell us so. Surely the phrases "terra in aeternum stat," "and heaven is above us," "the sun rises," and the like, have a popular meaning which is perfectly true, and which might be revealed by God, and which if revealed by God, incidentally or otherwise, in that popular sense, we should be bound to believe as *de fide*.

But apparently this is not what Cardinal Newman means, for in the next sentence he says: "And it seems unworthy of divine greatness that the Almighty should, in His revelation of Himself to us, undertake mere secular duties, and assume the office of a narrator as such, of a historian, or geographer, except so far as the secular matters bear directly on the revealed truth." Does any one assert that God in His revelation undertakes the office of narrator, *as such*, or historian, or geographer? We thought it was a well-known distinction made by Catholic theologians of every school between the things revealed *propter se*, or, as the Cardinal calls them, matters of faith and morals, and things revealed *per accidens*, including every other statement made in Sacred Scripture whether in narratives, history, geography, or anything else. God reveals none of these things *propter se*. He does not undertake the work of annalist, historian, geographer, *as such*. They are revealed on account of their connection, necessary, useful, or accidental as the case may be, with the main purposes of Divine Revelation. But as Benedict XII. in his Dogmatic Catalogue of the Errors of the Armenians very clearly signifies, they must be all believed, even those which have been revealed *per accidens*, because they are all equally the word of God, and all serve a useful purpose

in the divine economy of our salvation.¹ “For *whatsoever* things were written, were written for our learning; that through patience and the comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope.” (*Rom.* xv. 4.)

And what is man that he should undertake to pronounce what is worthy, or what is unworthy of Divine Majesty? If we were to attempt to do so, especially in God's revelation, where should we stop? Does not the Socinian think it unworthy of God to reveal mysteries? The Rationalist, for a somewhat similar reason, denies miracles. The ordinary Protestant contends that the Catholic teaching about the Blessed Eucharist is utterly unworthy of God, and so he gives up the literal, and adopts a metaphorical sense. It is the old story—*Durus est hic sermo, et quis potest eum audire?* Our reply is—*Quis cognovit sensum domini, qui instruat eum?* Human wisdom left to itself would say that of all unworthy things the most unworthy of God was to redeem the world by the “folly” of the cross; and it did say it by the mouth both of Jew and Gentile.

We have no objection to the statement that faith and moral conduct is the “drift” of the teaching that has the guarantee of inspiration, or that the Council of Trent insists on faith and morality as the “scope” of inspired teaching, provided always it is not thereby implied that Scripture is not also inspired throughout, even in those things which to us seem to have least connection with faith and morals. It is in this sense and in no other sense the Council of Trent speaks. In the *preamble* of the chapter it states, as Cardinal Newman says, that faith and morality are the “scope” of inspired teaching, and that the Gospel “fount” of all saving truth and all instruction in morals; and this is perfectly true, but the *main proposition* to which everything else is incidental is contained in the following words, which necessarily imply the inspiration of every single statement made by sacred writers. “*Sacrosancta . . . Synodus . . . orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, necnon*

¹ See Franzelin note, Thesis iii., p. 352. The 114th *Error* in the Catalogue seems to consist in the fact that the Armenians assumed a historical statement in Genesis to be *false*.

traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel oretenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas et continua successione in ecclesia Catholica conservatas pari pietatis affectu et reverentia suscipit et veneratur." From the beginning of the chapter to the word *veneratur* is one single sentence; the last part, as written by us, contains the main assertion, the purport of which is perfectly clear: that as God is the author of all the books of the Old and New Testament, and, as the divine traditions regarding faith and morals were either spoken by Christ himself or dictated by His Holy Spirit, therefore the Council accepts and venerates both with equal affection of piety and reverence—and why?—because they are both equally the Word of God. It must be carefully observed that the words "tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes," refer only to the traditions, and have nothing at all to do with the preceding words. And they were inserted, as Pallavicini tells us, in order to distinguish the divine traditions, of which God is the author, and which concern faith and morals, from purely apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, which are of their own nature disciplinary and mutable. So far, therefore, is the Council of Trent from lending any countenance to the idea that all Scripture is not inspired, that it distinctly affirms the divine authorship of all the books of Sacred Scripture, and as we have seen, pronounces anathema against those who would dare to assert that they are not "sacred and canonical," and inspired Scripture throughout.

There is one point to be carefully kept in mind in any discussion on this important question, if we wish to avoid grave errors—the difference between *inspiration* and *revelation*. Inspiration, as we shall see further on, in its plenary sense, implies three things, the divine afflatus moving, enlightening, and guiding the writer—*inspiratio active sumpta*: the *state* of the human agent under this divine influence—*inspiratio passive sumpta*; and, lastly, the product of the combined action of God and man, that is, the book written by the Holy Spirit through man's agency—which is *inspiratio terminative sumpta*. Inspiration, therefore, in reference to Sacred Scripture, essentially regards the *writing*—the writing *in*

fieri, and the writing *in facto esse*. Not so in the case of revelation. It need have no connection with inspired writing at all. In its active sense it is simply the divine manifestation of hidden things, and sometimes of things not previously hidden ; in its objective sense it merely means the things so made known by God. Inspiration, therefore, necessarily implies revelation in the wide sense given above ; but revelation, as in the case of divine traditions not contained in Scripture, may have nothing at all to do with inspiration. Let our readers bear this in mind, for the Cardinal goes on to say that " the Vatican Council pronounces that supernatural *revelation* consists *in rebus divinis*, and is *contained* in *libris scriptis*, et sine *scriptis traditionibus*," italicising as above, and implying thereby, it seems to us, that all Sacred Scripture is not necessarily divine truth or a divine revelation, and that revelation and inspiration are identical.

What the Council says on the first point is contained in the following sentence, and certainly will not admit the meaning given above by implication :—" Huic divinae revelationi tribuendum quidem est, ut ea, quae *in rebus divinis* humanae rationi per se impervia non sunt, in presenti quoque generis humani conditione ab omnibus expedite, firma certitudine et nullo admixto errore cognosci possint." I do not think the Council declares in that sentence that revelation consists " in things divine," but even if it does, then all we can say is, that every statement in Scripture is divine, or, what comes to the same, is the Word of God—as St. Paul himself asserts, at least by implication, regarding the Scriptures certainly of the Old Testament, if not also of some of the New—*πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος*, etc. If every scripture is *θεόπνευστος*, it may well be called divine.

As regards the second point, the Council does say that the supernatural *revelation* is *contained* in the written books and unwritten divine traditions ; but concerning these same books it says in the very next sentence, that the church does not regard them as sacred and canonical, merely because they *contain* this *revelation* without error, but because, having *been written* under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have

God for their author, and as such have been handed down to the church. "Eos vero (libros) ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet, non ideo quod sola humana industria concinnati, sua deinde auctoritate sint approbati, nec ideo duntaxat quod *revelationem* sine errore contineant; sed propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi ecclesiæ traditi sunt." To say, therefore, that the divine books contain the revelation of God, and even without any error, is declared by the Council itself to be an inadequate description of their sacred and canonical character.¹ The reason is manifest. A book might contain the whole revelation of God, and contain it without error, and yet not be at all an inspired book, because inspiration essentially regards the writing or authorship of the book. If it is an inspired book God is its author; it must have been written in all its parts under the guidance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God, so much so, that God becomes responsible for every single statement it contains, and therefore quite as much responsible for its statements "in matters of fact," as for its statements in reference to "faith and morals." All these truths will not have the same intrinsic importance in relation to each other, or to the economy of man's redemption; but they are all divine as regards their origin and their authority.

And now this leads us to give, in conclusion, a very brief explanation of the nature of inspiration as taught in all Catholic schools, and as it is contained in the writings of the Fathers, and of all our eminent theologians, since the Council of Trent. Catholic teaching on this point has become still more definite and dogmatic since the definitions of the Council of the Vatican already referred to.

The points of Catholic dogma clearly defined are, (a) that God is the author of all the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, (b) that these books have been *written* under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God, (c) and hence the entire books are inspired. The second of these points more clearly and accurately defines the meaning of the first; and the third expresses the abiding consequence of the other two,

¹ See Franzelin, page 375, Thesis IV.

that is, the inspiration of the sacred books *terminative*, as the theologians call it.

God, then, is defined to be the author of all the Sacred Scriptures, *because* they were written under the inspiration of His Holy Spirit. Now, what is meant by being the author of a book in this sense? It must mean here, as it means everywhere else, either that He Himself wrote it, as He wrote the Tables of the Law, with his own finger, which, of course, is out of the question; or that He dictated the sacred books word for word to the inspired penmen, an opinion which has been held by few, but is now justly and generally rejected; or finally, as a *minimum*, it must mean according to the use of language, that He directed or procured the writing of all these sacred books; that He suggested to the sacred writers all the *matter* to be written—*res et sententias*—even that known before, and finally gave them such constant, ever watchful assistance in the composition of all these books as to ensure that everything which He wished should be said, and that nothing should be said except what He wished, and hence that there should be no trace of falsehood or error, for which He, the principal and infallible Author of the book would, in that absurd hypothesis, be held responsible. The very nature of divine authorship requires this at least; if the instrumental author begin to write *motu proprio*, it is in no special sense God's work; if he write anything which he is not directed to write, it is not God's work so far; and if there could be errors or mistakes in any book written by divine authority, God could never claim that book whole and entire, with all its parts, as purely and simply His own—as written in its entirety under the inspiration of His Holy Spirit. Therefore, the divine authorship of the Sacred Books, in the sense *defined by the Church*, imperatively requires that, as a *minimum*, the impulse to write should come from God, that He should suggest at least the matter, and that He should preserve the sacred writers from all error, which, if it were possible, would not be the error of man, but of God. It is as absurd to say that a man could commit sin under the impulse of the Holy Ghost, as to say that the sacred writer could write error under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

Therefore, as it is *de fide* that the Sacred Books, whole and entire, were written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, it follows, at least as a conclusion theologically certain, that everything written by the sacred writers is, what it is called in Scripture, and by the Church, and by the Fathers, and by the people, verily and indeed the Word of God, unmixed with any false, or erroneous, or *merely* human element.

This doctrine, regarding the nature of inspiration, does not imply that God did not, in most cases, leave the choice of the words to the sacred writer. It does not even imply that the words chosen were the most elegant, or most appropriate, for expressing the divine ideas in the writer's mind. It does not imply the adoption of the graces of style, nor the niceties of grammar, nor exactness in scientific or rhetorical arrangement. But it does imply that the words must be suitable to express the writer's divine thoughts, that his language must be intelligible, and that the arrangement must not be such as will necessarily lead the readers astray.

Again, inspiration does not exclude antecedent knowledge of much of the matter to be written, nor labour in its acquisition, provided always it is written by the human author of the Sacred Book, not *motu proprio*, but in virtue of the divine impulse, consciously or unconsciously followed, and written also under the divine guidance, lest any error might creep in, of which, as it could not originate from God, He could not accept the authorship or responsibility.

Neither does our doctrine on inspiration imply that it is confined to the autograph of the sacred writer. Inspiration does not, *terminative* sumpta, consist in the *material* book as such—in the handwriting, the ink, and the vellum; but it consists in the book as a series of signs, with a definite objective significance for the mind of man: and hence the inspired books remain, although the autographs have all perished.

Of course, what we have been saying only regards that which has been actually written by the sacred writers. We are not now speaking of any additions, omissions, or other changes in the sacred text. We know, however, for certain, that in the Vulgate, at least, these corruptions do not involve any error

in faith or morals, or interfere with the substantial integrity of the text.

It will be observed that we have not, except incidentally, appealed to Sacred Scripture in support of our views, nor quoted the Fathers, many of whom speak in exceedingly strong language of the impossibility of the smallest error in Sacred Scripture. Neither have we cited the authority of all the great scholastic and modern theologians,¹ from St. Thomas to the present time, who, if they do not go much further in the direction of verbal inspiration, without exception deny the possibility of merely human, and therefore possibly erroneous, statements in Sacred Scripture.

In conclusion, we wish to observe, that it is with great reluctance we deem it our duty to dissent from the views which Cardinal Newman has put forward regarding the inspiration of the Sacred Scripture. We think, with St. Augustine, that the possibility of a falsehood in Sacred Scripture would be fatal to the Sacred Volume. "I pay the canonical books," he adds, "such reverence and honour, that I most firmly believe that no sacred writer in writing committed the least mistake." ² On the other hand, to use the words of the learned Patrizi, while the Church is silent, we, of course, do not dare to censure those views, but neither do we dare to hold them. In one respect at least we beg to follow the excellent example of the Cardinal, by unreservedly submitting our observations, such as they are, to the judgment, and, if necessary, to the correction of our ecclesiastical superiors.

¹ The opinion of Lessius, Du Hamel and Bonfrere, put forward by them only as a hypothesis, is no longer tenable since the Vatican Council. In any case the doctrine of *subsequent* inspiration does not touch the present question.

² *De Consensu Evang.* I., II, 12.

CARDINAL NEWMAN ON THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE.¹—No. II.

CARDINAL NEWMAN has done us the honour of publishing a "Postscript" in reply to the observations which we felt it our duty to make in the March number of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, concerning the Cardinal's article on "The Inspiration of Scripture" which appeared in the February number of the *Nineteenth Century*. The Cardinal is not indeed over complimentary to ourselves in some of his observations; but of these personal references we have no intention of taking any further notice; they have nothing to do with the question. Then, the Cardinal is now a very old man, whose name and office are equally illustrious. Moreover, he has done signal service to the Church, not only in the British Empire but far beyond its borders. Such a man is certainly entitled to a liberty of speech in discussion to which we have no right to lay claim. Furthermore, we owe him a debt of gratitude, which we can never repay, for the pleasure and profit which we derived from the perusal of his writings. And we should greatly regret if any expression of ours should cause him the least annoyance. We did our best to guard against that danger; and we have been assured by several persons, in whose judgment we place the highest confidence, that our article was, as it ought to be, written in a tone of becoming respect to his Eminence the Cardinal.

We mean now to write in the same spirit, and to be even still more cautious against giving the least reasonable cause of offence. But to question the views, and especially views that appear to be novel, of any ecclesiastic, no matter how eminent, when they are publicly expressed, cannot of itself give reasonable cause of offence. Theologians are in the habit of questioning the opinions of the greatest men that have ever appeared in the Church. They ought to do it.

¹ Reply to the Cardinal's "Postscript on Inspiration" in answer to the preceding paper.

in a respectful way ; but then there is nothing to prevent them giving their own opinions with firmness and with candour. We give his Eminence credit for the highest motives in what he has written about Inspiration. We have reason to think he will not deny to us likewise credit for good motives ; and that he will allow us also reasonable freedom of speech. No one is bound by our opinions but ourselves, and they can have no possible weight except in so far as they are sustained by argument. If anyone should say to us—Why do you dare to criticise the views of so great a man as Cardinal Newman ? Our answer is—First, the Cardinal himself invited discussion on the subject. Secondly, a theological journal like the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* could not with propriety be silent on a theological question which aroused the attention of all the priests in the three Kingdoms. Thirdly, we thought, and we still think, that if the views insinuated rather than definitely stated in the *Nineteenth Century*, were allowed to pass unchallenged, bearing the authority of Cardinal Newman's name, they would do much to unsettle the teaching regarding Sacred Scripture, which we consider not only as sound but as obligatory, and which has been hitherto held sacred, at least in Ireland.

The Cardinal complains that we only spent a short month "in reading, pondering, writing, and printing" our article. He himself, he says, spent a twelvemonth at his own ; and, he adds, by way of contrast, that had we not been in such a hurry to publish, we should have made a better article. That is very likely ; but we are not bound to optimism even when the discussion is about Inspiration. The time that was enough for the readers of the *Nineteenth Century* to master the Cardinal's Article surely ought to have been enough for us. We ought, we dare say, be ashamed to confess it ; but as a matter of fact we could not afford even a full month for the article. We hope our readers will make allowance for our deficiencies both in the last article and still more for those in the present ; for we could not by any possibility give a month to either. Perhaps we may be allowed to say, however, by way of apology for our seeming rashness, that we have spent a good many years in the study of theology and that it was

not within the last month nor within the last twelve months, that we learned the Catholic teaching on Inspiration, the arguments by which it is supported, and the objections that are raised against it.

In the opening pages of the "Postscript" there is nothing further that concerns us at present. We have nothing now to say to the question—how far Inspiration should be regarded as an abiding charisma. We are dealing only with inspired books. But when he comes to Section 2, concerning Inspiration "in matters of Historical Fact," the Cardinal charges us with representing him as excluding historical statements of fact from the range of Inspiration. "The Professor," he says, "has done his best to make it appear that the Bible, as far as it is historical, does not in my view proceed from inspired writers." We must respectfully demur to this accusation. We think there is no foundation for the charge. Here are our exact words: "He (the Cardinal) certainly seems to imply that it is not *de fide* that Scripture is inspired in those things *if there be any such* which are not matters of faith and morals." It is perfectly clear from the words in italics that we understood the expression "matters of faith and morals" in its wide sense to include not only what is *per se*, but also what is *per accidens*—as the theologians say—a matter of faith or morals. In other words, we took it exactly in the same sense as the Cardinal himself explains it in that very Section 13 which he charges us with overlooking. "In this point of view," he says, "Scripture is inspired not only in faith and morals, but in all its parts *which bear on faith*, including matters of fact." Whatever *bears on* faith is clearly a *matter* of faith, and therefore every statement of fact *bearing on* faith becomes clearly a "matter of faith;" and "matters of fact" in our sense evidently meant matters of fact not bearing on faith. "Hence," we said, "he, the Cardinal, raises the question, but does not answer it—whether there may not be in Scripture as there are in the dogmatic utterances of Popes and Councils, *obiter dicta*, or unimportant statements of fact, not inspired and therefore unauthoritative." It is very evident from this sentence alone, that the "matters of fact," which we distinguished from "matters of faith

and morals," were these unimportant statements of fact not inspired according to the Cardinal, and therefore unauthoritative; and because we were not sure whether the Cardinal actually admitted such or not, we inserted the clause in italics—"if there be any such."

Again, the Cardinal, in Section 8, in answer to the question, what dogmas a Catholic is free to hold about Scripture, said, "I reply there are two such dogmas; one relates to the authority of Scripture, the other to its interpretation. As to the authority of Scripture, we hold it to be, *in all* matters of faith and morals, divinely inspired throughout." Now if the Church, as the Cardinal says, by *defining* the inspiration of Sacred Scripture "in matters of faith and morals" includes in that *definition*, which as such is a *formal* statement of its own contents, all matters of fact bearing upon faith; if the Cardinal himself repeatedly uses the expression (see "Postscript," page 11), in the same sense, so as to include "historical statements of fact," why should not we also have a right to use it in that sense? The entire context shows that we took "matters of faith and morals" throughout, to include "matters of fact bearing on faith," and that we took the expression "matters of fact," in opposition to the other, to mean throughout what the Cardinal now calls matters of *mere* fact. If we had put any other meaning on the expression "matters of faith and morals" in Section 8, we should be forced to assume that the Cardinal contradicted himself; for in that Section he gives the complete Catholic dogma to be that "in all matters of faith and morals" Scripture is inspired throughout; but long after, in Section 13, he says it is *de fide* that Scripture is inspired in matters of fact *bearing* on faith; therefore the former includes the latter. We naturally and inevitably, with these paragraphs before our eyes, took it in that sense; so we understood the Cardinal throughout; so we spoke, and so we argued.

What, then, was our argument? It was this: "If we take the expression (of the Councils) 'entire books with all their parts' to be equivalent to the Cardinal's word 'throughout,' we have a right to conclude that the Catholic dogma as enunciated in that canon, proclaims that these canonical

books are inspired throughout, and, therefore, not merely in questions of faith and morals." It will be observed in the first place that we took the phrase *throughout* to be equivalent to the Council's expression, "entire books with all their parts." It is in this sense alone we took it, and we said so; and it is in this sense alone we are responsible for it. What precisely the Cardinal meant by it we cannot say. But it is very easy to see what we are to think of the Cardinal's inference from our use of the word, when he says, "that if Scripture is inspired 'throughout' in the Professor's sense, it cannot but be *verbally* inspired." The sole question under discussion regarded the *extent* of inspiration; not a word in this connection was said about the *mode* or *manner* of inspiration. On that point, as far as we can judge, the Cardinal and ourselves are agreed. Yet from our statement of the Catholic dogma that the Sacred Scripture is inspired throughout, or *extensive* in the sense explained, the Cardinal declares that it follows, that Scripture must be *intensive* verbally inspired!

The second point regards the restrictive clause introduced by the Cardinal in his expression of the Catholic dogma. We said, taking *throughout* in the sense already explained, that no restricting clause of any kind ought to be introduced, that the adequate expression of Catholic doctrine simply is "that the Sacred Scriptures are inspired throughout."

The question is not whether the restricting clause excludes many things or few things from the range of Inspiration. What we objected to was its presence there at all.¹

On this point of "restrictions upon Inspiration," the Cardinal declares that "he is shocked to find a Catholic Professor asserting that such a dogmatic decision (as he has given), is what he (the Professor) calls a restriction." The answer is obvious. We beg to say with firmness, but with all respect, that we never called any dogmatic decision of the Church a restriction. What we said was that in our opinion, the Cardinal's statement of the Church's dogma was unduly restricted, which is a very different thing.

We added nothing to the Church's dogma, and we took

¹ We think the Cardinal's language in the notice to the "Postscript" is not so objectionable on this ground.

nothing from it. We expressed it *exactly* as it has been expressed by the Council of Trent, and especially by the Council of the Vatican. "If any one," says the Council of Trent, "shall not receive as sacred and canonical the *entire* books themselves with all their parts . . . let him be an anathema." ¹ The Council of the Vatican explains very clearly what is meant by sacred and canonical: "These (the books with all their parts) the Church holds as sacred and canonical, not for this reason, that having been composed by human industry alone they have been then approved by her authority; nor for this reason merely that they contain revelation without error, but because having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author, and as such have been handed down to the Church." "Sed propterea quod *Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti Deum habent auctorem*, atque ut tales ipsi ecclesiae traditi sunt." Then follows the canon: "Si quis Sacrae Scripturae libros *integros cum omnibus suis partibus*, prout illos Sancta Tridentina Synodus recensuit, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, aut eos divinitus inspiratos esse negaverit; anathema sit."

The dogma of the Church, regarding Inspiration, so far as it is strictly *de fide*, is contained in these passages, and we find therein no clause restricting the inspiration to "matters of faith and morals." And notwithstanding the Cardinal's assertion, we must say that we can find no dogmatic statement *concerning inspiration* either in the Council of Trent or the Council of the Vatican, which limits it, or even appears to limit it, to matters of faith and morals. If there is, let it be produced. Scripture is simply declared to be inspired throughout in the sense we have already explained. Whether that definition is compatible, with holding the admissibility of *obiter dicta* is a very different thing, which we shall discuss forthwith. What we now object to, and what we raised our first objection to in the last paper, is the *form* in which the Cardinal puts the Church's dogma. The restricting clause has not been inserted in the expression of her dogma, by the

¹ "Si quis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus prout in Ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt et pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, . . . anathema sit."—Sess. 4.

Church. It is misleading, because it *seems to imply* that there are things in Sacred Scripture which are neither *per se* nor *per accidens* matters of faith and morals—a thing that we cannot at all admit, for everything in it, in our opinion, “bears upon faith.”

It is for these reasons that we objected to its being taken as the adequate expression of the Church's dogma. It is satisfactory to find that in the third paragraph of the “Notice” to the “Postscript,” the Cardinal says that “these two Councils (Trent and the Vatican) *decide* that the Scriptures are inspired, *and inspired throughout* ;” after which he explains, in the same sentence, what the Church means by that expression. If the same form of speech had been used in the *Nineteenth Century* paragraph in setting forth the Catholic dogma, this first issue would never have been raised. All we want is, let the defined dogma be that the Scriptures are inspired throughout. The form of the dogma is one thing ; the explanation of its meaning is another.

Now we come to examine the other question—Whether *obiter dicta* are admissible in the Sacred Scripture, which is inspired throughout in the sense explained. What then are these *obiter dicta* ? The Cardinal says, in the opening part of the section (page 14) “by *obiter dicta* are meant phrases, clauses, or sentences in Scriptures about matters of mere fact, which, as not relating to faith or morals, may without violence be referred to the human element in its composition.” On page 15, he says, “*obiter dictum* means, as I understand it, a phrase or sentence which, whether a statement of literal fact or not, is not, from the circumstances, binding on our faith.” On page 18 the Cardinal says, “I repeat, *obiter dicta* are but ‘unhistoric’ statements.” These are taken from the “Postscript ;” but in the article, page 198, besides matters like St. Paul's reference to his *penula*, the Cardinal says, “By *obiter dicta* in Scripture, I mean *also*—the italics are ours—such statements as we find in the Book of Judith that ‘Nabuchodonosor was King of Ninive.’” It follows, therefore, that this statement from the Book of Judith is an “unhistoric” statement in the Cardinal's sense of that adjective ; and we dare say that many other similar

“unhistoric” statements of fact may be found in the Books of the Old Testament. We are still more puzzled about these “unhistoric” facts that are to be regarded as *obiter dicta*, because the Cardinal himself says (No. II of the Essay), “that it seems unworthy of Divine Greatness that the Almighty should, in his revelation of Himself to us, undertake mere secular duties, and assume the office of a narrator, as such, or an historian, or a geographer, except so far as the secular matters bear directly on the revealed truth.”

If, therefore, the sacred writer wrote any history as such, not bearing directly on revealed truth, it seems that such history might fairly be considered as “unhistoric” *obiter dicta*. Then we must take the liberty of asking—are the numerous geographical facts mentioned in the Sacred Volume to be regarded as *obiter dicta*? and what of the chronological facts—the numerous dates and ages mentioned throughout the Sacred Volume, as, for instance, the ages of the Patriarchs? Are they, too, *obiter dicta*? Then there are some ethnological facts in Sacred Scripture, and the Book of Job makes some statements that might be fairly considered zoological. The geologists have long considered certain pronouncements in Genesis as inconsistent with their own science; and since the time of Galileo, the alleged standing of the sun has been ridiculed by astronomers. What then are we to think of all the facts mentioned in Sacred Scripture in reference to these various sciences? Are they *obiter dicta* or not? If the decision of the question could be always left to a man of great learning and reverent mind, we might not perhaps be so much uneasy; but if each of our Catholic scientists is to be allowed to make his own selection of *obiter dicta* in his branch of knowledge, we are likely to have a pretty long catalogue of them, and the Church is likely to have a busy time of it in correcting their perversions of Scripture.

The main question, in our opinion, regarding these *obiter dicta* is twofold: first, are they inspired? Second, may they be *erroneous*? We cannot give our opinion regarding the admissibility of *obiter dicta* in Scripture until we are able to answer these two questions. First, then, are *obiter dicta*, in their natural and obvious sense, inspired? We do not now

inquire whether a text may have one or more literal senses. It would only lead us away from the main question, and end in confusion. If the *obiter dicta* are inspired in their ordinary and obvious sense, they are then as authoritative as any other parts of Sacred Scripture, and we need not discuss the question further. But the Cardinal himself has explained them to be "unauthoritative," "mere unimportant statements of fact," "having no relation to faith and morals," and, therefore, we have a right to infer, not inspired.

The next question is—may they be erroneous? In reference to this matter the Cardinal says—"Why does he (the Professor) always associate an *obiter dictum* with the notion of error?" We answer, because if it is not inspired there is always the *possibility* of its being erroneous. We have no guarantee that the sacred writers are infallible when they are not inspired. The *obiter dictum* is either the word of God, or the word of man. If it is the word of God, it cannot of course be erroneous; but if it is the word of man, then, *omnis homo mendax*, the word of man is always liable to error. The Cardinal says we should not attribute to him the association of error with *obiter dicta*. Well, we did not do so; but we inferred from his idea of an *obiter dictum*, not that it *was* erroneous, but that it was, as such, *possibly* erroneous. We objected to the possibility of there being in inspired Scripture "merely human and therefore *possibly* erroneous statements." This furnishes an obvious answer to what the Cardinal says lower down:—"Does the Professor mean to say that such a dictum is *necessarily* false when it occurs in a dogmatic document?" Certainly not; no one could think it; but we mean to say, there is always a *possibility* of its being false in dogmatic documents, and also in Sacred Scripture if it could be there.

Now what are we to think on this point? The Cardinal, it seems, is unwilling to take the responsibility of associating error with these *obiter dicta*. Are we then to deem them infallible although not inspired statements? We fear this hypothesis would afford small comfort to the Catholic scientists, because infallible *obiter dicta* in Scripture would be just as much in their way as inspired *obiter dicta*. We

cannot leave this *main* point undecided ; the Cardinal will not determine it, and hence we must define an *obiter dictum* for ourselves.

We take *obiter dicta* to be uninspired, merely human, and, therefore, *possibly erroneous* statements of any kind though coming from an inspired writer ; and the question is—what are we to think of the opinion that would hold such statements as admissible in Sacred Scripture ? No one can object to our putting the question in this fashion ; we do not mean to assert that any one actually holds it to be a free question.

In our last paper we held it to be a conclusion theologically certain that, as it is *de fide* that the Sacred Books were written whole and entire under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, everything written by the sacred writers in these Books was, what it is called in Sacred Scripture, and by the Church, and by the Fathers, and by the people, verily and indeed the Word of God, unmixed with any false, or erroneous, or *merely* human element.

It is unnecessary for us to say more now, lest we might by any possibility give offence. We think it is at least theologically certain that *obiter dicta* in the sense explained above are inadmissible in the Sacred Volume. It cannot be expected that in a short paper such as this, we should furnish all the evidence that seems to us to establish this conclusion. It is mainly a question of what theologians call authority ; and hence we must cite a few writers to show what was the view of the great theologians on this question. But first, in order to form a practical judgment on the matter, it is well to recall to mind certain well ascertained theological principles.

The first is, that a doctrine may be obligatory on Catholics although not *de fide*. Proposition XXII. condemned in the Syllabus is as follows :—"Obligatio qua Catholici magistri et Scriptores omnino adstringuntur coarctatur in iis tantum quae ab infallibili Ecclesiae judicio, veluti fidei dogmata ab omnibus credenda proponuntur."

It manifestly follows from the condemnation of this proposition that the obligation in reference to points of doctrine incumbent on Catholic teachers and writers cannot

be restricted to those things that are put forward as *de fide*. Now, as it is not to be greatly wondered at, if the un-theological reader should think that it is free to him to reject any doctrines which are not *de fide*, we must explain our meaning and the mind of the Church on this question, and fortunately we have a high authority to guide us.

It would indeed be a fatal error eminently calculated to lead to the destruction of the habit of faith itself to suppose that our obligations in this matter were restricted to giving our adhesion only to things pronounced to be *de fide*. The habit of faith though not destroyed may be greatly weakened or wounded in the soul by sins even remotely against the virtue of faith. An opinion, for instance, may not be strictly speaking heretical, and yet it may proximate to heresy, or be erroneous, or rash ; such opinions even if held with contumacy would not be sins of heresy ; but they would according to the common opinion be sins at least remotely against the virtue of faith, and in the end might easily lead to the total destruction of the saving gift. To take a case in point : the *authenticity* of the Vulgate, that is, its substantial conformity, etc., with the original texts, has been decided by the Council of Trent. Yet this is not a revealed truth, and it cannot be heresy to deny it ; still it is pre-eminently a dogmatic fact, in the decision of which the Church is infallible, and whoever should deny it would certainly commit a mortal sin against what is sometimes called ecclesiastical faith, gravely injurious too to the *virtue* of Divine faith. And as the Church is infallible in the whole realm of dogmatic facts, it follows that to deny any of these facts would be to sin at least indirectly against faith as explained above. Cardinal Newman himself has very justly compared the infallibility which the Church claims in this border-land of revelation to the pomoria around ancient cities, or the dominion which our sovereigns claim over what are called British Waters.¹

Again, the Church may formally condemn a proposition as erroneous, or savouring of heresy, and if she does, no good Catholic could think of teaching or holding such a proposition after such condemnation. In other cases, even

¹ *History of My Religious Opinions.*

when the Church has pronounced no formal sentence, the proposition in question though not directly and immediately against faith, may be so clearly deducible from a defined doctrine, or so manifestly opposed to the ordinary magisterium of the Church, or so inconsistent with Catholic doctrine in both these respects, that the theologians commonly regard it as erroneous, or next to heresy ; while some of them may even go the length of describing it as heretical doctrine. No Catholic theologian could consider himself free to hold such an opinion, on the ground that its contradictory was not strictly *de fide*, or that the Church did not insist on his rejecting this proposition under penalty of forfeiting her communion. It is very necessary, at least for the sake of those who are not theologians, to bear these truths in mind in the discussion of this question.

We should bear in mind, too, what is sometimes forgotten, that a doctrine may be strictly *de fide*, though never defined by a Pope or General Council ; that is, when it is set forth as a revealed truth by the *magisterium ordinarium et universale* of the Church. (See Con. Vat. c. iii. *De Fide*). Neither can we admit that this magisterium is so uncertain as to leave the definitions of Popes and Councils to be the only practical rule for the guidance of the faithful. Theologians at least are always required to keep an eye on the *magisterium ordinarium* of the Church, that is, on the teaching of the Fathers, on the consensus of bishops and theologians, and even on the belief of the faithful generally.

It was in reference to these points that the late illustrious Pontiff Pius IX., laid down for the guidance of Catholics the following admirable principles in the celebrated letter which he wrote in 1863 to the Archbishop of Münster and Freiburg. They will serve to explain the condemned proposition referred to above, and to show in what sense it is obligatory on the consciences of the faithful. The Pope refers in the opening part of the extract to certain persons who unduly restricted the obligation of Catholics in this matter :—

“ Dum vero debitas illis deferimus laudes, quod professi sint veritatem, quae ex Catholicae fidei obligatione necessario oritur, persuadere Nobis volumus noluisse obligationem qua Catholici Magistri et Scriptores omnino adstringuntur coarctare in iis tantum.

quae ab infallibili Ecclesiae iudicio veluti fidei dogmata ab omnibus credenda proponuntur. Atque etiam nobis persuademus, ipsos noluisse declarare, perfectam illam erga revelatas veritates adhaesionem, quam agnoverunt necessariam omnino esse ad verum scientiarum progressum assequendum et ad errores confutandos obtineri posse, si dumtaxat Dogmatibus ab Ecclesia *expresse definitis fides et obsequium adhibeatur*. Nam etiam si ageretur de illa subiectione quae fidei divinae actu est praestanda, limitanda tamen non esset ad ea quae expressis oecumenicorum conciliorum aut Romanorum Pontificum huiusque Apostolicae sedis decretis definita sunt, sed ad ea quoque extendenda quae ordinario totius Ecclesiae per orbem dispersae magisterio tanquam divinitus revelata traduntur, ideoque universali et constanti consensu a Catholicis Theologis ad fidem pertinere retinentur."

Lower down in the same letter the Pope, speaking of the obligation incumbent on Catholics, who devote themselves to the speculative sciences, says it is not enough to accept the dogmas of the Church :—

"Verum etiam opus esse ut se subjiciant tum decisionibus, quae ad doctrinam pertinentes a Pontificiis Congregationibus proferuntur, tum *its doctrinae capitibus quae communi et constanti Catholicorum consensu retinentur ut Theologicae veritates et conclusiones ita certae ut opiniones eisdem doctrinae capitibus adversae quanquam haereticae dici nequeant tamen aliam Theologicam merentur censuram.*"

We beg to call the special attention of our readers to this last paragraph, because it clearly points out the obligation incumbent on all loyal Catholics, and especially on the students of speculative sciences, of submitting not only to the doctrinal decisions of the Roman Congregations, but also to those heads of doctrine, or doctrinal points as we should call them, which are held by the common and constant consent of Catholics as theological truths and conclusions so certain that the contrary opinions, although not heretical, nevertheless merit some theological censure. It is not necessary that these objectionable opinions should have been actually branded with an *authoritative* censure ; it is enough if they be such as to merit it. We hope our readers will not forget this declaration of the Pontiff in the subsequent discussion of this question. The Cardinal has informed us that "his especial interest in this inquiry is from his desire to assist those religious sons of the Church, who are engaged in biblical criticism and its attendant studies, and have a conscientious fear of transgressing the rule of faith, men who wish to ascertain how far their religion puts them under obligations

and restrictions in their reasonings and inferences on such subjects." ¹ It is an excellent purpose. Yet at the same time it cannot but be useful to remind such men, in the words of the Pope, that the obligations of Catholic writers and professors are not to be restricted to those dogmas which have been defined by the infallible authority of the Church; that the perfect adhesion to revealed truths, which they also must admit to be necessary for the refutation of error as well as for all true scientific progress, is not to be limited to dogmas *expressly* defined by the Church; that this adhesion must also be extended to truths propounded as appertaining to faith by the ordinary and universal magisterium of the Church; and that there is a *further* conscientious obligation of submitting not only to the *doctrinal* decisions of the Roman Congregations, but *also* to those points of doctrine which although not *de fide* are held by the common and constant consent of Catholics to be theological conclusions so certain that the opposite opinion would merit some theological censure.

We think it would be very misleading in the discussion of this question not to give due prominence to the admirable principles enunciated in this letter by the supreme teacher of the universal Church.

It will be remembered that in our last paper we endeavoured to point out that any uninspired statements in Sacred Scripture were incompatible with that divine authorship of the integral books, with all their parts, which has been defined to be a matter of Catholic faith. We endeavoured to show, too, that Inspiration, as defined by the Vatican Council, was inconsistent with any statements in Sacred Scripture, of which the Holy Ghost could not accept the responsibility both in point of truth and morality. We said that "it was as absurd that a man could commit sin under the impulse of the Holy Ghost, as to say the sacred writer could write error under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost." "Why change impulse into inspiration in the second clause?" says the Cardinal. We answer, because Inspiration is *more* than an impulse; it implies constant, infallible, and efficacious guidance also, which the other does not. "But grace can

¹ Article in the *Nineteenth Century*, No. 7.

co-exist with sin," says the Cardinal. Yes ; *habitual* grace with *actual* sin ; but an *actual* grace, or impulse, could not be given for the performance of a sinful work ; and so we said an actual impulse of the Holy Spirit could not be given to write certain things, if these things could, by any possibility, be false.

So far we have merely indicated the theological reasons that might be deduced from the language of the two Councils against *obiter dicta*. We now propose to try and ascertain what were the views of the great theologians and of the Fathers on the same point. A constant *consensus theologorum* is of itself an absolutely certain argument in favour of a point of doctrine put forward as belonging to the deposit of faith ; and one will always find that there is a similar consensus amongst the Fathers, because in both cases they are merely witnesses to the belief of the Church.

There may, indeed, in any particular case, be doubts about the universality of this consent either of the theologians, or of the Fathers ; and a corresponding doubt will be thrown on the infallible or the *de fide* certainty of the doctrine. Hence we propose to let the reader judge for himself how far the language of the theologians and Fathers as quoted by us, is likely to indicate a consensus against the admissibility of *obiter dicta* in the sense already explained.

First, we have Bellarmine (*De Verbo Dei*, Book I. c. 6) :— " The last," he says, " is the *heresy* of those who hold that in the Epistles of St. Paul, and in the other sacred and divine books, *all* things were not written at the dictation of the Holy Spirit ; but that some things were occasionally written under the guidance of mere human wisdom and human reason." Here is the text : " Postrema eorum *haeresis* est, qui in ipsis B. Pauli epistolis aliisque sacris et divinis libris non omnia scripta esse volunt dictante Spiritu Sancto, sed aliqua interdum sola prudentia et ratione humana duce."

In our time, Bellarmine adds, Erasmus renewed the *same heresy*, for in his annotations to the second and to the twenty-seventh chapters of St. Matthew, he not obscurely wrote, " that we need not be apprehensive, lest the authority of all Scripture should be overthrown if some small errors

were detected therein." "This *heresy*," adds Bellarmine, "has been refuted by Epiphanius, by Jerome, and by Augustine, whose (Augustine's) authority Erasmus abuses; for Augustine teaches that any falsehood would be altogether unworthy of the Evangelists, not only the falsehood of lying, but also the falsehood of forgetfulness—"Non solum eam quae mentiundo promitur, sed etiam eam quae obliviscendo." Such is Bellarmine's teaching on this question, and Franzelin (see *infra*), says that Bellarmine calls it *heresy* to deny the inspiration of even such statements as St. Paul's about his *penula*.

It is unnecessary for us to speak of De Lugo's high authority in the schools of Catholic theology. He does not formally discuss the question of the Inspiration of Sacred Scripture, but in his famous treatise on Faith—probably the best on the subject that has been ever written—he lays down the following doctrine regarding that proposing of revealed truths by the Church which is necessary to make them *de fide*. (Dis. xx., sec. 2, n. 58, page 771, Vives' edition). "For," he says, "the Church *clearly and manifestly* proposes Scripture to be believed, and *each and everything* contained therein: if, therefore, it is perfectly clear that *anything* is contained in Scripture, it must be regarded as equally clear that it is proposed by the Church to us to be believed."—"Nam ecclesia clare et manifeste proponit credendam Scripturam, et omnia et singula in ea contenta: si ergo manifeste constat aliquid in Scriptura contineri, *aeque manifeste* constare debet id ab ecclesia nobis credendum proponi."

According to De Lugo, therefore, it is perfectly clear and evident that *everything* manifestly contained in Sacred Scripture is to be believed as of Catholic faith, for it is of that belief he speaks; and hence he says lower down that "those to whom the meaning of Scripture is manifest, so that there can be no reasonable doubt or fear about it, even though other Catholics, to whom it is not so manifest, should doubt that meaning, not only sin gravely against faith by rejecting it, but also commit the *sin of heresy*, and are truly and properly heretics." Now, we find in the Book of Judith that "Nabuchodonosor was King of Ninive." This is a statement so clear that there

cannot be a shadow of doubt about its meaning. The Cardinal "sees no difficulty in regarding it as an "unauthoritative statement of fact,"¹ but De Lugo says that it is *perfectly clear and evident* that the man who denies it is a heretic.

Not to multiply quotations, we assert that it is the teaching of all our great theologians from the Council of Trent to the present time that one of the ways in which the Church defines is by a *clara scriptura*; so that everything *clearly* stated in Sacred Scripture is *eo ipso* de fide catholica. See for instance amongst our latest writers, Hürter and Murray (Dis. I., Sec. II, No. 174). The former says, "Cum Ecclesia S. Scripturam tanquam Dei verbum omnibus proponit fidelibus, sequitur absque ulla ulteriore ecclesiae declaratione vel interpretatione pertinere ad fidem Catholicam *omnia illa* quae in divinis litteris ita clare continentur ut a nemine negari possint nisi ab eo qui vel Sacram Scripturam abjiciat vel rationem exeat." Everything, therefore, clearly contained in Sacred Scripture is proposed to us by the Church to be believed *as of faith*. Suarez, in answer to the question whether Sacred Scripture is an infallible rule of faith, replies that Scripture is an infallible rule of faith—quod est *de fide* certum. What he means by Scripture is evident, because, after saying that this truth has been defined in the Council of Trent, he *proves* his proposition from reason by observing (No. 8) that "if it were possible that any false statement could be found in Scripture *its whole authority would be destroyed*, and therefore it has no less certainty in the *smallest* than in the *greatest* things"—"propter quod non *minorem* certitudinem habet in *minimis* quam in maximis." And in No. 14 he goes on to ask, whether in Divine Scripture there is anything which has not been written by the Holy Spirit, and which consequently would not be Divine Scripture. "To which I briefly reply, that the canonical writer has written *nothing* of his own, or in a merely human spirit, but *each and every thing* was written under the direction of the Holy Ghost; so Jerome and *Augustine* teach as was shown above, and it is a thing that *is most certain*, as Canus shows at length, and sufficiently proved from the fact that all Scripture would

¹ *Nineteenth Century* Article, No. 26.

otherwise be rendered uncertain and a falsehood could be found in it," which Suarez evidently considers a *reductio ad absurdum*. (See Dis. V., Section iii., Nos. 6, 8, 14, Vives' Edition.)

As Suarez quotes Canus, and evidently adopts his opinion, and as Canus was moreover present at the Council of Trent, and is regarded as one of the very highest authorities on the *Loci Theologici*, we think it right to quote his teaching also.

In Book II., Chapter xiv. *De Locis*, he first gives the arguments of those who held that the sacred writers in the Canonical books did not always speak under the influence of the Holy Ghost. The question he puts himself is, "whether the sacred writers in the Canonical books sometimes speak in a human spirit and without divine and supernatural revelation—an auctores sacri in libris canonicis spiritu interdum humano sine divina et supernaturali revelatione loquantur?" An affirmative answer to this question Canus qualifies as an *impious error*, which he attributes to Erasmus and to others whom he does not wish to name. He then proceeds to refute this impious error by showing that it would be destructive of the authority of Sacred Scripture, as St. Augustine pointed out in his letters to St. Jerome—"cujus erroris nota Erasmo quoque, ut alios dissimulem, inusta est. Is autem error *quam sit impius* illo primum argumento demonstro, quod Sacrarum Scripturarum magna ex parte labefactatur auctoritas, si haec opinio vera est." The authority of Melchior Canus on this question is all the more weighty because he was by no means in favour of verbal inspiration, and only admitted a substantial authenticity in the Vulgate.

A still more liberal theologian in the matter of Inspiration *quoad modum* was the celebrated Jesuit, Mariana, whose Dissertation on the Vulgate has always been regarded as a high authority. It is published by Migne in the first volume of his "Cursus Completus" of Sacred Scripture. The heading of Chapter VI. is—"An aliquid humano sensu sit in sacris litteris positum?" And in the text he asks, "Whether we are to admit that anything written in a merely human spirit and sense is contained in the Divine Books, which would be therefore liable to error, *for to error as well as to vanity we and*

all our works are subject, except we are ruled and guided by a higher wisdom." And his answer is that the thought is impious—" *nefas est de divinorum librorum veritate dubitare, quorum ipse Deus Auctor est, ut mortis et interitus expers ita ab omni mendacio alienus.*" His argument is that which we ourselves put forward in our last paper, that the divine authorship of the Sacred Books, being a truth which is *de fide*, excludes the possibility of anything merely human and possibly erroneous coming from the writer who is under the inspiration of God. The very thought is *impious*, as Mariana goes on to prove against the Anomoeans and some other early heretics who ventured to put forward that opinion.

Marchini's work on the "Divinity and Canonicity of the Holy Bible" is well known to be one of the first of the more modern authorities. It was published in 1770, at Turin, and was republished at the same place in 1874, by two professors of Sacred Scripture, Giovannini and Villoresi. In this edition, Art. V., page 88, the author says—and his language is worth remembering—"That man *most perniciously errs* and takes away from the word of God a firm assent, who should suspect that in writing the sacred authors fell into the *smallest mistake of any kind*"—"perniciossissime ergo errat et firmam Verbo Dei assensionem tollit, qui vel minimo cujuscunque generis peccato lapsos esse scribendo auctores Sacros suspicetur." More emphatic language could not be used than to describe this in theological language as a most pernicious error. And at page 82, he says—"Neither does the distinction between *small* and *great* things diminish this *error*, as if forsooth the Sacred writers could not err in the graver things but could be mistaken in small things." Whence he concludes that beyond all doubt—"res etiam ad salutem non necessarias in Scripturis dirigente, praesente, inspirante, illuminante auctore Spiritu Sancto, esse exaratas."

We cannot afford space for more quotations from older theologians; we have simply given specimens of the language held on this question by the most eminent amongst them. Anyone can see for himself that the Vatican Council has left the point still less open to question by defining that the entire books, with all their parts, were written or composed under

the inspiration of the Holy Ghost—" Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti Deum habent auctorem."

It is only natural, therefore, that the theologians who have written since the Vatican Council should use equally strong language. We cannot quote them now: we may refer, however, to Hürter,¹ Schouppe,² Lamy,³ and Mazzella,⁴ as holding precisely the same views as the older theologians. We have already referred to the opinion of Dr. Murray of Maynooth, an eminent theologian, who gave his life to the study of theology. We know, of our own knowledge, how profoundly shocked he would have been if anyone, in his presence, ventured to question the inspiration of the most minute point in Sacred Scripture. As the Cardinal has referred to St. Thomas, we mean to reserve our observations on his teaching until we just come now to speak of St. Augustine, whose words St. Thomas quoted.

But of all the modern theologians, we venture to say that there is none equal to Cardinal Franzelin for sound doctrine and solid learning on every question connected with the inspiration of Sacred Scripture. He has made a particular study of that branch of theology, and we believe his treatise *De Scriptura et Traditione*, is generally regarded in the schools as the best book on the subject. He is a living writer, familiar with all the controversies of the day, who has been elevated to the purple on account of his eminent merits as a theologian. We venture to think that in future ages he will be regarded as the greatest dogmatic theologian of our time. No man has exhibited a greater mastery of principles, a wider range of ecclesiastical learning, or a keener insight in handling theological questions in accordance with the analogy of faith. He would be a rash theologian indeed, who, knowing his works, would despise his opinion. He has written an appendix to his treatise *De Scriptura et Traditione* on the very question we have just now been discussing. We do not at all mean to attribute to Cardinal Newman the views on which Cardinal Franzelin so severely animadverts. We feel, however, that in this unequal contest it is well for us to try

¹ *Thesis* xxvii. ² *Theol. Dog.*, Page 214. ³ *De Inspir.* No. 33.

⁴ *De Virt. Inf.*, 949.

and shelter ourselves under the authority of great names. The ecclesiastical readers, for whom our observations are written, will be able to judge for themselves, and to ascertain, whether our principles or Cardinal Newman's are most in accordance with the doctrine and the principles laid down by Cardinal Franzelin. Hence, we publish, as a kind of supplement to this article, the first part of Cardinal Franzelin's dissertation on this question.¹ We think any priests, whose views are more or less uncertain, might read the dissertation with profit; but if they wish to study the question in all its bearings, they must master the entire treatise *De Scriptura et Traditione*.

One or two short extracts from the Fathers and we have done.

Theologians are agreed² in understanding by the term "Fathers" those who possess the four following notes—eminent learning, extraordinary sanctity, venerable antiquity, and the express or tacit recognition of the Church. Origen and Tertullian alone may be regarded to some extent as exceptions to this description, but the Church within certain limits admits them also. The unanimous testimony of the Fathers is regarded as an infallible evidence of divine tradition (Schouppe, *De Trad.* No. 175). But if the testimony is not unanimous, it is more or less open to doubt, according to the divergence of opinion. It has been said that as we have no catalogue of the Fathers we can have no certain means of ascertaining this consensus. In the Gelasian decree "*De Libris Recipiendis*" there is a pretty full list of the Fathers up to the end of the fifth century, and it is not difficult to enumerate the later ones. Indeed it would be rather a strange thing for the Council of Trent to forbid us to interpret Scripture contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers if we had no means of ascertaining with moral certainty when they are unanimous.

Of course those Fathers who maintained verbal inspiration would never dream of tolerating the admission of an *obiter*

¹ The first part of Cardinal Franzelin's Dissertation was published in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for June, 1884, from which number this Paper was withheld.

² See Murray *De Traditione*, No. 485; Hürter, No. 165, *Thesis* xix.

dictum. Origen in one place ¹ says that "all Scripture is divine wisdom given from above even to its minutest letter." ² St. Gregory Nazianzen extends the "perfect veracity of the spirit even to every point and line;" and many similar testimonies may be found in the writings of many of the Fathers.

But it is more to our present purpose to show what the Fathers thought of those who would deny the inspiration of any single statement in Sacred Scripture, even of those apparently the most trivial and minute.

St. Epiphanius, for instance, speaks of the "shamelessness" of the heretic Aetius and his disciples, who, when upbraided with certain testimonies of Sacred Scripture, *blaspheme* the names of the Prophets and Apostles by saying, "The Apostle spoke that as a man." ³ In the estimation, therefore, of St. Epiphanius it is a *blasphemy* against the inspired Apostles to say they spoke this or that Scripture as men.

Not less strong is St. Basil's brief commentary, "To admit even one idle word," he says, "in Sacred Scripture, is a grave and intolerable *blasphemy*." ⁴

St. Jerome, in the Preface to the Epistle to Philemon, censures severely those who would reject this Epistle, because in their estimation it regarded the necessities of daily life, and to suppose that such topics formed the subject of inspired scripture would have been unworthy of the Holy Ghost. It is "*valde et simpliciter errare*," says the saint—a grave and obvious error—to suppose that it is wrong in any way to attend to our physical needs and to suppose that the spirit of God would be driven away from the inspired writer when he comes to speak of them. The whole purpose of the Prologue is to show the absurdity of this error. (See Franzelin on St. Jerome's testimony).

St. Augustine, perhaps more than any of the Fathers, insists on the grave character of this same error, because his far-reaching and capacious mind saw clearly the ruinous

¹ *Selecta in Psalmos*, I. 4.

² *Apol.* II., No. 105.

³ Βλασφημοῦσι μὲν οὖν προφητῶν ὀνόματα καὶ ἀποστόλων . . . λέγοντες; τοῦτο ὁ Ἀπόστολος ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἔφη. Heresis 76, versus finem.

⁴ 10th Hom. in Hexam., as quoted by Mazella, No. 950.

consequences to the authority of the sacred volume that would result from its adoption.

St. Augustine, in a letter which he wrote to St. Jerome, whose personal acquaintance he had not yet made, after some complimentary observations on Jerome's great services to sacred learning, makes references to certain commentaries, circulated under St. Jerome's name, in which St. Paul's reprehension of St. Peter (*Gal. ii.*, **II.**) is represented, not as a *bona fide* reprehension, but as a mere pretence. St. Augustine, thinking that this *simulatio*, as described in the second chapter of the Galatians, would be equivalent to a *mendacium* in Sacred Scripture, calls upon Jerome, in the most solemn language, to reject any such interpretation and correct his views, if the alleged statement were indeed written by him, "because," he adds, "any falsehood in Sacred Scripture would be fatal to the Sacred Books. The question," he says, "is not whether such a falsehood would be *justifiable*, but whether it could be at all admissible in Sacred Scripture." And then he adds the following weighty words, to which we would call the attention of every student of the Sacred Volume, especially in our perilous times:—

"Admisso enim semel in tantum auctoritatis fastigium officioso aliquo mendacio, nulla illorum librorum particula remanebit quae non, ut cuique videbitur vel ad mores difficilis, vel ad fidem incredibilis, eadem perniciosissima regula ad mentientis auctoris consilium officiumque referatur."

Elsewhere, as we have seen, Augustine uses similar language in reference to the admissibility of any false statement in Sacred Scripture, whether it be the "falsehood of lying," or "the falsehood of forgetfulness."—"eam quae mentiendo promitur vel eam quae obliviscendo." (Book II., *De Consen. Evang.*)

For further quotations from St. Augustine on this point, we must refer the reader to Cardinal Franzelin's admirable dissertation, a portion of which we published in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for June, 1884. Such, for instance, is Augustine's emphatic statement: "de Prophetarum et Apostolorum scriptis quod omni errore careant dubitare, nefarium est." (*Ad Hier. Ep.* 82). And again, speaking of the history of Creation, as given in Genesis, Augustine says,

“Scripturam veracem esse nemo dubitat nisi infidelis aut impius.”

These testimonies from Augustine are very important in regard to the present discussion, because, at page 19 of the “Postscript,” the Cardinal has the courage to bracket together St. Augustine and St. Thomas, as if they were in favour of the admissibility of uninspired, and, therefore, possibly erroneous *obiter dicta* in Sacred Scripture! What was the real opinion of St. Augustine may be learned from the few short extracts we have given. As Cardinal Franzelin says, there is not in his writings a *trace* of any such opinion—nay, more, he emphatically declares in his letter to St. Jerome, that the admissibility of *obiter dicta* would be utterly subversive of the authority of the Sacred Volume.

And we shall show that such was the opinion of St. Thomas also; indeed, hitherto no one has ever thought of questioning St. Thomas's views on the matter. But the Cardinal, at page 17, asserts that St. Thomas clearly implies that there are, or might be, in Sacred Scripture, statements of fact “which, in their literal sense, come short of the historic style, and historic truth, or what I should call *obiter dicta*.” No doubt it is a delicate way of putting it—to say that “they come short of historic truth;” for it must mean simply that these statements of fact, in their literal sense, are not always true.

Let us now examine the language actually used by St. Thomas, and try to ascertain what he really did say. The Passage may be found in the “Summa, Pars Prima, Quaestio 102. Art. I.”

St. Thomas asks in this article—*Utrum Paradisus sit locus corporeus?* As usual, he first sets forth the objections to the affirmative of this proposition; and then, following the authority of St. Augustine, he adopts the affirmative answer as his own opinion, in the following words:—“Respondeo, dicendum quod sicut Augustinus dicit (*De Civ. Dei*, L. xiii., c. 21), quae commode dici possunt de intelligendo spiritualiter paradiso nemine prohibente dicuntur, dum tamen et illius historiae fidelissima veritas rerum gestarum narratione commendata credatur.” These are

the words of Augustine quoted by St. Thomas, and then St. Thomas himself adds, "Ea enim quae de Paradiso in Scriptura dicuntur per modum narrationis historicae proponuntur. In omnibus autem quae sic Scriptura tradit *est fundamento tenenda veritas historiae, et DESUPER spirituales expositiones fabricandae.*" Exactly. The objection to be answered, as stated in the previous paragraph, was that some understand what is said in Genesis about Paradise *tantum corporaliter*, some understand it *spiritualiter tantum* and some in both ways *spiritualiter* and *corporaliter*. St. Thomas in reply adopts the principle of St. Augustine, and says there is nothing to prevent a person from giving a spiritual or mystic meaning to what is said in Genesis about Paradise, *provided always* the absolute truth of the Scriptural narrative of facts be first admitted. Then, says St. Thomas, accepting the truth of the fact as the ground-work, you may over and above that—*desuper*—seek for any spiritual meanings you please. So far is St. Thomas from distinguishing as the Cardinal does between "historic," and "unhistoric" statements of fact, as if the former were always true but the latter not necessarily so, that on the contrary, following St. Augustine, he asserts that we must first of all accept the truth in the obvious sense of every statement of fact made in Scripture—*veritas historiae*—and then you are free to seek for mystical meanings, founded on these facts. Now it is said in Genesis, ch. ii., that "God planted a paradise of pleasure from the beginning in which He placed man whom he had formed," and hence St. Thomas argues thus—there is here a statement of fact, as such we must accept it as true, therefore, paradise is a *locus corporeus*; although over and above its literal meaning that passage may have also a spiritual meaning founded on its literal signification. We venture to think that any theologian who reads the text and context of St. Thomas, cannot doubt for a moment that such is its true meaning; and if it is, it proves that according to the mind of St. Thomas, *obiter dicta*, that is, uninspired and possibly erroneous statements of fact, are altogether inadmissible in Sacred Scripture.

We think we have said enough on the question. We entered upon its discussion with reluctance, and we have

continued it with still greater reluctance. But, on the other hand, in our opinion, interests of supreme importance are at stake. If the views put forward by his Eminence the Cardinal were allowed to go forth unchallenged, in a short time the admissibility of uninspired *obiter dicta*, in the widest sense of the word, would come to be regarded as a free opinion. We think such doctrine would be fatal to the authority of the Sacred Volume. Every theologian who has written on this question since the time of St. Augustine thought so too. They proclaim with one voice that the admission of merely human and possibly erroneous statements would destroy the authority of Sacred Scripture. What one person would consider a matter appertaining "to faith or morals," and, therefore, inspired, another would hold to be a purely "unauthoritative statement of fact," to be accepted or rejected at pleasure. One passage, as St. Augustine says, would appear incredible to this man, another would appear of doubtful morality to that. One text would be at variance with the known facts of history; another would be inadmissible on account of its chronology; and of course anything incompatible with the latest scientific theories in geology, in cosmogony, or the other natural sciences would be scouted as having no claims at all to be regarded as inspired. Only a few shreds of the historical books would be left, when M. Rénan and his associates had done with them; and so the Word of God would soon come to be regarded as the word of man, except in so far as the Church might have defined the inspiration of any particular text. *Scriptum est* would become an unmeaning formula; that Scripture of the Old Testament, which St. Paul declares to be all inspired, would in most things come to be regarded as less authoritative than the writings of Philo or Josephus. "The argument of Augustine," says Bellarmine, "is unquestionably sound, for if once an error were admitted in Sacred Scripture, whether the mistake was made from ignorance, or forgetfulness, or any other human infirmity, whatever passage was quoted, the question at once would be raised whether in that passage the sacred writer was nodding or not,¹ The preacher could not cite any texts with certainty as

¹ *De Verbo Dei*. Liber i., c. 6.

the Word of God to enforce his lessons of morality. The dogmatic theologian could only argue with effect from those passages, and they are very few, whose meaning was defined by the Church; and Sacred Scripture would thus lose most of its divine authority.

It was the conviction of these dangers that moved us to make a protest against the admission of any such principles. We cannot admit an *obiter dictum* of any kind in Sacred Scripture. We have the greatest reverence for him who put forward this opinion as tenable. We give him full credit for the holiest motives. We are, as we have already said, under a debt of gratitude to that illustrious man for the pleasure and profit derived from the perusal of his works which we can never repay. But we cannot accept his views on this momentous question. That opinion, as far as we know, has not been held by any theologian of eminence. It is, we think, contrary to Scripture, contrary to the teaching of the Fathers, contrary to the consensus of theologians, and contrary, though not perhaps directly and immediately, to the utterance of the Church. We cannot, therefore, to put it in the mildest way, regard it either as a free opinion or as a safe opinion.

Our views, therefore, may be briefly summed up in the following extract taken from one of the London newspapers that took notice of this controversy:—

1. It is *de fide* that the *entire* books of Sacred Scripture with all their parts are inspired.

2. Taking, as we said, the word *throughout* to be equivalent to the expression “entire books with all their parts,” it follows that it is, in *that sense* of the word, *de fide* that Sacred Scripture is inspired “throughout.”

3. It appears to us to be an inaccurate expression of the Catholic dogma to say that “Sacred Scripture is, *in all matters of faith and morals*, inspired throughout.” We object to the restricting clause for two reasons: first, it is not found in the *de fide* definitions of the Church regarding *inspiration*; secondly, it is misleading, in so far as it seems to imply, by the very wording of the dogma, that there are in Scripture some things not in any way matters of faith and morals, and which therefore need not be inspired.

4. We hold it to be theologically certain that "*obiter dicta*," as explained by his Eminence, are inadmissible in Sacred Scripture ; and that it is obligatory on Catholics to regard them as inadmissible, although we do not say that this is strictly *de fide*.¹

¹ This paper was written and printed in May, 1884 ; it was intended for publication in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for June, but it was withheld at the time from public circulation, because, as announced in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, "though it might aid doctrine it might also wound charity."

Towards the end of the same month of June the writer was chosen by the Pope to be Coadjutor Bishop of Clonfert. When Cardinal Newman heard of this appointment he gave striking proof of the charity and nobility of his own character. In a letter to Dr. Walsh, (the present Archbishop of Dublin), then President of Maynooth, he expressed his satisfaction at the appointment and expressed a hope that Dr. Healy would accept a small present from him. Shortly after his Eminence wrote the following letter to Dr. Healy himself :—

BIRMINGHAM, *July 30d*, 1884.

MY DEAR LORD BISHOP ELECT,

I thank you for your kind message through Dr. Walsh, and for your acceptance from me of the offering which I proposed to make to you.

That a long life and a career of successful and happy service in the Church of God may be granted to you from above is the sincere prayer of

Your faithful servant,

JOHN H. CARD. NEWMAN.

P.S.—This requires no immediate answer ; you may be going on Retreat, and must have many occupations besides.

The Cardinal's offering was a beautiful copy of the Canon used by Bishops when celebrating Mass. It is still treasured as a memento of the discussion on Inspiration, and a noble testimony to Cardinal Newman's exalted worth. The writer (Dr. Healy) in his letter of thanks expressed regret, as he thought his duty, for any expression of his in the course of the discussion that might have caused any annoyance to his Eminence.

BROWNSON'S WORKS.¹

WE have received a copy of the works of the late Dr. Brownson collected and arranged by his son, H. F. Brownson, and such a collection deserves special notice at our hands. Brownson was before the English-speaking world as a publicist for fifty years. During twenty years of that he was groping his way honestly and earnestly to the light; during the remaining thirty years, when his mind was illumined by faith and his soul at rest in the conviction of truth, he did brilliant service to the cause of Catholicity both in America and in these islands. He undoubtedly fell into errors, but, as he himself truly observes, the Church is tolerant of many strange opinions in philosophy and politics. She leaves her children a large realm for free discussion in all things in which "freedom is compatible with the end for which she has been instituted. Her wish is not to rear a race of slaves but of free and loyal worshippers of God."

We are inclined, therefore, to give Brownson all credit for his great services to the Church, and to look with much forbearance on what we consider to be unsound, although not quite heterodox, philosophical principles. Few men travelled over a wider domain—philosophy, politics, ethics, and religion—he discusses them all with a courageous and inquiring, yet withal, a reverent spirit. He was a docile son of the Church and bowed to her authority; but in the free and ample realm of speculation, he soared aloft on strong and fearless pinions, generally in the sun-light of truth, but sometimes in the mists of error.

In the beginning of his career Brownson was in philosophy an eclectic, and in religion a naturalist. It was the result of the principle of private judgment in both cases; for naturalism is a logical outcome of Protestantism, and eclecticisim only means

¹ The Works of Orestes A. Brownson, collected and arranged by Henry F. Brownson, Detroit: Thorndike Nourse, 1882-3.

that each philosopher should select for himself what he thinks right, and reject what he thinks wrong, in every system. This right of judging for oneself, which implies the right of judging and condemning every body else, was very flattering, and, therefore, very acceptable to a young and able man just let loose from his university studies.

But eclecticism could not satisfy an inquiring mind. He knew too much not to know that his own authority was but a poor foundation for a religious or philosophical system; and he saw so many errors in the other self-constituted teachers of mankind that he soon perceived the necessity of aid and light from above to strengthen and illumine the gloom and weakness of human nature. As he himself emphatically expressed it, "A man cannot lift himself by his own waistbands;" neither can any one else on the same level do it for him. The light and the help must be from the very nature of things—*desursum*—from above. The man who accepts this principle honestly must, of logical necessity, become a Catholic; and so Brownson, following the 'kindly light' that led another and a greater mind to the Church, placed himself under the guidance of the late Bishop Fitzpatrick of Boston and soon found that light and peace in the City on the Mountain which he had for so many years vainly sought elsewhere.

Although a neophyte in Catholic theology, Brownson, by the advice of Bishop Fitzpatrick, still continued to write articles on philosophy and religion in his Review; for it was felt that what came from him would have much greater weight with non-Catholics than anything spoken or written by those who were born in the bosom of the Church. He certainly dealt very severe blows at Protestantism in America. Rarely attacking it directly, his incidental thrusts were felt to be irresistible. Protestantism, he used to say, is composed of two elements, the negative and positive. In so far as it is positive it holds fast to a portion of the truth, which, however, is in no sense its own, but the inheritance of the Catholic Church. In so far as it is negative, it denies the truth of God on the strength of purely individual opinion, and inasmuch as the individuals are all divided amongst themselves, it follows

that Protestantism, as such, in so far as it has anything of its own, is infidel, denies the truth of God, and hence, as history proves, finally resolves itself into Atheism.

In his philosophy—and Brownson was before all things a man of philosophic mind—he was an ontologist. It is not easy to ascertain what phase of ontologism Brownson adopted, for he censures Malebranche, openly attacks Gioberti, sneers at the Rosminian *ens in genere*, and pronounces the Germans to be, as no doubt they are, altogether heterodox ontologists. Yet we think the differences, at least in the first three cases, are only accidental, and that the ontologism of Brownson is radically as untenable and as dangerous in its consequences as any of the systems which he reprehends. In his Essay on the Existence of God he asserts “that as a matter of fact every man, in every act of intelligence, in every exercise of the understanding, in every thought, apprehends and asserts *that which is God*, although he himself may not be distinctly conscious that such is the fact.”¹ His whole argument in favour of the existence of God is founded on the fact that the “mind of man has immediate and direct intuition of being.”² that this being is “real being,” and he adds, “it is equally certain that this real being is necessary and eternal being, and therefore God.”

This is going far enough, it is ontologism pure and simple, the ontologism of Malebranche; but Brownson goes further. He asserts that, the “belief in God is one that the mind, not furnished with it, could not originate.”³ This opinion, since the Vatican Council and the censure of the Louvain Propositions, in 1866, is one that can no longer be safely held. It must, however, be said that this essay was written in 1852, before the ultimate development of the Traditionalistic Controversy. Brownson accordingly rejects the *a posteriori* argument for the existence of God as either inconclusive in form or an undue assumption of the thing to be proved. But his reasoning clearly shows that he had need to study more carefully and systematically the Scholastic Logic of which he makes so light. The Scholastics, he says, deny all intuition, that is, direct and immediate cognition, of real and necessary.

¹ Vol. i., page 257.

² Vol. i., page 268.

³ Vol. i., page 258.

being, and yet they contend that real and necessary being is legitimately inferred from the cognition of contingent existences. They must hold then, he contends, that the conclusion contains more than the premises, which is against the second rule of the Syllogism.¹ It is very manifest from this statement that Brownson confounds the matter of a proposition with its form, and because the second rule of Syllogisms imperatively requires that no term shall have (*ratione formæ*) greater extension in the conclusion than in the premises; therefore, the existence of infinite being cannot be inferred in the conclusion from the existence of contingent being which is asserted in the premises!! But, urges Brownson, the truth of the conclusion is, according to the Scholastics themselves, contained in the truth of the premises; and, therefore, he who has intuition of the premises—that is, of contingent being, has therein also intuition of the conclusion—that is, of the existence of God. Is there no difference, then, between what is contained formally or explicitly, and what is contained virtually in the premises? Do the boys beginning their Euclid who “intue” the axioms of the First Book, “intue” also, by the very fact, the *pons asinorum* and the 47th proposition? If they did, it would be for them a great blessing, for it would save them much labour and, sometimes, many stripes. Yet the truth of the 47th is virtually contained in the truth of the axioms, but it needs a long chain of demonstration to educe the scientific cognition of the former from the intuitive truth of the latter. In like manner, from the principle of contradiction and the existence of contingent beings we can, by a process of reasoning, educe the existence of God; but it does not, therefore, follow that he who has intuition of the two former truths hath therein direct and immediate intuition of the latter. Brownson may have meant well, but greatly erred on these points, as also when he thought it necessary “to teach our Scholastic Psychologists—St. Thomas and the rest—that to their demonstrative method (of proving the existence of God) they must add tradition or history, and prove to the heterodox that true philosophy can be found only where the primitive tradition and the unity and integrity of language have been

¹ *The Schools of Philosophy*, page 284.

infallibly preserved, therefore only in the Catholic Society or Church." In so far as this proposition implies that the knowledge of one God cannot be obtained with certainty from created things, by the light of reason, it is now contrary to the defined doctrine of the Catholic Church.¹ And in so far as it implies that this *knowledge* is not *scientia* obtainable by *a posteriori* reasoning from the existence and wonderful order of the created universe, without any need of primitive tradition, such statement is at least erroneous and no longer tenable by Catholics. For although the Council used the word *cognosci*, the medium of knowledge is declared to be *per ea quæ facta sunt*, and elsewhere *e rebus creatis*, which can hardly be understood of intuition, but rather of reasoning from created things. It is manifest, at least, that human reason is self-insufficing for the purpose, and that tradition is certainly by no means necessary to enable men to know or prove the existence of God.

His son informs us, that Dr. Brownson greatly loved his country, but detested the dominant radicalism, which, he adds, if unchecked, cannot fail to lead a nation to destruction. In his detestation of radicalism he has our hearty sympathy. He is undoubtedly right in the view, apparently endorsed by his son, that "no government can be a good government if divorced from religion, and moving on independently of the Church." Hence he severely condemns those Catholics "who adopt the false maxim that their politics have nothing to do with their religion," and its inevitable consequence that the Church or the Pope has no right to interfere with politics—a principle that has been recently put forward by people who call themselves Catholics! As if, forsooth, politics have nothing to do with morals; as if peoples and governments never do wrong; or, when they do, are not amenable to the law of God, and to the authority of His Church. This doctrine has been condemned in the Syllabus,² and is undoubtedly erroneous; for it is a virtual denial of the authority of God and of the rights of His Church. For what is meant by

¹ "Si quis dixerit Deum unum et verum Creatorem et Dominum nostrum, per ea quæ facta sunt naturali rationis humanæ lumine certo cognosci non posse: anathema sit." Can. II., No. 1, Concil. Vat.

² Props. 24, 27, 42, 56, 58, 59.

politics ? Etymologically as well as philosophically they mean the affairs of the State, the practical science that ascertains and expounds the rights and duties of all the members of the body politic, but especially of the government in all its branches towards the people and of the people towards the government. Even Aristotle laid down the doctrine that this science was a branch of ethics, and the same view is repeatedly put forward in the dialogues of Plato. In moral theology the discussion of these questions constitutes a special part of the treatise on justice—it is known as “*Justitia Legalis*.” To say that the Pope, as expounder of the moral law, has no right to interfere in questions of politics, is, therefore, to deny his right to teach the Church of God, both rulers and subjects ; in other words, it involves heresy.

It may be said, however, he has the right to teach speculatively, but we need not accept him as the judge in actual cases of controversy when they arise. The Pope, on the contrary, is the divinely appointed “*Judex controversiarum*,” not only in all purely spiritual questions of faith and morals, but also in all temporal questions *where the interests of faith or morals are at stake*. In *purely* temporal or political questions, which have nothing to do with morality or with the salvation of souls, either as obstacles or necessary aids for the attainment of that great end for which the Church was instituted—with these the Church has no concern, she has neither the wish nor the right to interfere. But in regard to that large class of political questions in which the faith or morals of the children of the Church are concerned, where her highest interests are at stake, she has a divine right of interference, and she has divine guidance in her action, not in the sense that she is infallible in the decision of every point, but in the sense that God has furnished her with the means of deciding these questions throughout the entire Church, that she has the help of His Holy Spirit in making use of these means of action for the good of the Church, that she cannot be false to her high trust. Hence she has the right to decide in all doubtful points, not only questions of law but of fact, she has the right to decide the proper time and place and manner of intervention in all such questions,

and her children, one and all, are bound under pain of sin to yield her unhesitating obedience. This right *at least of a directive* guidance in political questions, and of commanding her own children under penalty of sin, has, as far as we know, never been questioned by any theologian of eminence ; not only Gerson and Fencelon, but even Bossuet himself when rightly understood admits it—on these questions, however, he is now no authority, for his teaching has long since been repudiated by the Church. But the Pope may be misinformed or mistaken—so said Luther, and the Jansenists, and the Disciples of Febronius. It is enough for us to know that the Ruler of the Church has the right to decide, and has abundant means of information and of action at his disposal with the unfailing guidance of the Holy Spirit in his government of the Church. And it is sin and disloyalty to assume that he acts rashly, inadvisedly, or unjustly.

As a matter of fact we know that the Church has always exercised her right of interfering in political questions connected with faith or morals. She has annulled penal laws, she has condemned secret societies, she has denounced godless education, she has interdicted States, excommunicated rebellious subjects, and, as an extreme resource, pronounced the deposition of outrageously tryannical kings, who violated their coronation oath, broke the constitutional pact, and raged like lions against the Church of God. To deny the right of intervention in many cases of politics is, therefore, erroneous doctrine, that has been repeatedly condemned by the Church. But on these questions Brownson seems to have gone quite as far as, if not farther, than Bellarmine. He was a courageous thinker as well as a keen logician. He always followed out his principles to their logical conclusions. Hence we are not surprised to hear from his son, what is evident enough from his own later writings, that he always, since he became a Catholic, maintained the supremacy of the Pope as the representative of the spiritual order over temporal princes. This supremacy has been formally asserted in two famous documents inserted in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*—the celebrated Decretal *Novit* of Innocent III. and the famous constitution *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII.

John, King of England, was summoned by his liege lord, Philip Augustus, King of France, to defend himself against the charge of assassinating his nephew, Arthur. John not appearing, as in duty bound, was found guilty of a felony, and Philip made war against him to punish his treason. John appealed to the Pope, and complained that Philip, in attacking his territories, had broken a sworn treaty of peace. The Pope, the great-souled Innocent III., sent letters and legates to both, imploring them to lay down their arms, submit their case to arbitration, and unite to make common cause against the Turks. Philip Augustus, unwilling to lose the fruits of his victories, told the Pope that in the matter of fiefs and vassals the king was supreme judge, and that the Pope had no right to interfere. Thereupon the Pontiff wrote his celebrated letter to Philip, one of the ablest documents on this question ever penned, in which he declares, "Non enim intendimus judicare *de feudo*, cujus ad ipsum spectat judicium . . . Sed decernere *de peccato*, cujus ad nos pertinet sine dubitatione censura, quam in *quemlibet* exercere possumus et debemus." It is the famous distinction, afterwards fully developed by Bellarmine, between the direct and indirect temporal power. The Pope has no direct right to interfere in the question of the fief, but if the alleged violation of feudal law involves a high crime against the moral law, the commission of which is asserted by one and denied by the other party who appeals to the Pope, then the Pope has, *jure divino*, the right to judge the moral question at issue between his children—it matters not whether they be peasants or princes. Thus it is that he has, as the representative of God, an indirect power of judging in temporal things; and it is so called, because directly it regards only the moral question, but indirectly it regards the temporal question which underlies it. The Decretal *Novit* to this day forms a part of the Canon Law, and, indeed it is manifest that the doctrine which it asserts can hardly be questioned by those who recognise the Pope to be the divinely appointed teacher and guardian of morality whom all Christians are bound to obey.

But Brownson emphatically proclaims the essential subordination of the temporal to the spiritual power. No

doubt the State is a perfect and independent society, and, it may be added, self-sufficing for the attainment of its own end. But that end is purely temporal ; it is the peace and happiness of man's life in this world, so far as it is attainable through the preservation of law and order, and the protection of life and property. No Christian, however, can assert that this is the final end of man or of society ; it is in reality only a means to an end, and it is a means that is divinely ordained to man's higher and supernatural end. God himself has, therefore, subordinated the temporal to the spiritual end of man, and consequently He has subordinated the society, whose end is merely temporal, to that society whose end is spiritual, that is, to the Church of Christ. And, as the Pope is the divinely appointed guardian of man's spiritual interests, it follows that he is entitled to receive the co-operation of all Christian rulers for that purpose, that the separation of Church and State involves the denial of a Christian duty ; that in any conflict of interests, real or apparent, the temporal must yield to the spiritual ; that in all matters of controversy the Pontiff is the supreme and final judge ; and thus has the two swords—the spiritual sword, which he bears himself, and the temporal sword, which, at least in *mixed* questions, is to be drawn under his guidance and according to his direction. The consequences of this doctrine are very far-reaching, yet, it is difficult to find a flaw in the reasoning involved ; and it is undeniable that, if carried into practice, Europe would not be, as it now is, an armed camp, where millions of men, when not engaged in bloodshed, live in idleness on the fruits of other men's industry.

But, although the Pope possesses these rights *jure divino*, it by no means follows that he ought to try and exercise them everywhere and always. He must look to what is expedient, that is, he must regulate the exercise of these powers with a view to the interests of the Church, according to the circumstances in which she is placed. Even in matters spiritual, he may forego, by Concordat for a time, the exercise of certain rights that are not essential, as, for instance, nomination to bishoprics, in return for certain advantages from the State—the regulating principle being always the

same—to keep in view what is most likely in the circumstances to promote the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

It will be seen that in most questions, Brownson was what is called a thorough Ultramontane. He believed that the Church was the salt of the earth, that the Pope was the divinely appointed teacher of governments and peoples, quite as much as of individuals. He held, that the nations who reject his authority are on the way to ruin ; for, from the Christian point of view, Atheism brings ruin. He could make no compromise with Gallicanism, and he believed the tyranny of the mob more dangerous even than the tyranny of despots. In all this we think his teaching is sound, and that, if he errs at all, he errs on the safe side. But we have not examined all the essays in these four magnificent volumes ; and, in the absence of an episcopal *imprimatur*, we must speak with caution. For a layman, the author displays a wonderful acquaintance with philosophy and theology. We think, however, he is by no means free from error, and that he might have treated the great Masters of the schools with more consideration. At the same time, we must admit that the first three volumes of this work contain very many singularly able and most interesting essays on almost every important question in philosophy and ethics, as well as on the relations between Church and State, and between reason and revelation. Of the fourth volume we are unwilling to pronounce any opinion, because the Editor himself admits that it contains many dangerous and anti-Christian theories advocated by the author before his conversion, and that he published them with much hesitation. They are not likely to harm the class of persons who will read Dr. Brownson's works, and have, moreover, been retracted and refuted again and again by their author ; but the world is so full of evil books, that we could very well afford to dispense with the immature speculations of even such a mind as Dr. Brownson's. For the rest, no one can deny him the praise of vast mental power, great and various learning, as well as of high purpose, and undaunted courage.¹

¹ This review appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, January, 1884.

THE NATIONALITY OF ST. BONIFACE.¹

THE learned Bishop of Ossory² has very kindly intimated his intention, in case he should have leisure, of setting forth Ireland's claim to St. Boniface in the March number of the *Record*. Meanwhile it may be well to indicate the reasons that have led us to believe that the apostle of Germany was of Anglo-Saxon, birth and parentage. We shall be delighted, however, if Dr. Moran can succeed in showing that to Ireland belongs the great glory of having produced the most illustrious Saint and Martyr of the eighth century.

The earliest extant life of St. Boniface was written by his disciple Willibald, who calls himself a priest, and seems to be the same Willibald whom Boniface appointed to the See of Eichstätt about the year 740. The life is dedicated to "Dominis Sanctis et vere in Christo charissimis Lullo et Megingozo coepiscopis Willibaldus licet indignus in Domino presbyter." Lullus succeeded St. Boniface, (who was martyred in 755), in the See of Mayence, and Megingozus had been for several years previous Bishop of Wurzburg in Franconia. The Life, therefore, must have been written within a few years after the death of St. Boniface, and by one who had ample opportunities of knowing all about him.

In the first chapter the writer of this life says :—"Postquam enim miro dispensationis Dei judicio carnalem ingens sancti viri patrem arripuerat languor, deposita mox pristina mentis pertinacia, puerum, *propinquorum* facta conventionem, ad monasterium quod priscorum nuncupatur vocabulo Adescancastre spontaneus a Domino quidem correptus direxit, etc., etc." This Adestancastre, or Adescancastre monasterium derived its name from the fact that it was ad Escam Castrum,

¹ A reply to a letter appearing in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for February, 1884, asking the Editor (Dr. Healy) for an expression of his views on the question.

² Now the Cardinal Archbishop of Sydney.

that is, near the fort on the Esk, a well known river in Devonshire, on the banks of which this monastery was situated. Not only, therefore, the father of Boniface—the Saint was then called Winfrid—but apparently all his relations, lived in the neighbourhood of this river Esk, and all the scenes of the subsequent events of the saint's youthhood, as narrated in this life, are laid in the south of England.

Boniface himself writing to Pope Zachary about the year 742 (epist. 49.) says :—" Quod non aestimamus esse verum, quia synodus et ecclesia *in qua natus et nutritus fui*, id est, in transmariana Saxonia, Londunensis synodus, etc." He was writing from Germany and describes the Church in which he was born and bred as in Saxon-land beyond the sea, and the synod or general assembly, of which it formed a part as the synod of London. The bishop, too, of his native church was Daniel, to whom several of his letters are addressed. Daniel was the Bishop of Wessex, or West Saxony, of which Devonshire formed a considerable part.

Wandelbert, a monk and deacon of the abbey of Prum, in the diocese of Fulda, wrote a metrical martyrology about the year 848, when he himself was only thirty-five. In this martyrology, first published by D'Achery, we find the following reference to St. Boniface on the fifth or Nones of June :—

Nonis antistes fulget Bonitacius, Anglis
Editus, ad Christum Oceanum qui traxit alumnos,
Frisonum puro submittere colla lavacro.

It is quite unnecessary to quote later authorities, because it has always admittedly been the common opinion amongst scholars that St. Boniface was a native of Kirton in Devonshire.

On the other hand, the following authorities are certainly in favour of the Irish birth of Boniface.

The Chronicon of Marianus Scotus. It is admitted on all hands that Marianus was an Irishman. In the Vatican MS.,¹ the original writer in his own hand and in the Irish language distinctly states that he was of Irish birth. This original MS. belonged to the monastery of St. Martin of

¹ The Codex Palatino-Vaticanus, No. 830, which is commonly regarded as an autograph. See Pertz, *Mon. Ger. His.* v., p. 481.

Mayence, and so there can hardly be any doubt that Marianus was not only an Irishman, but that he lived as a recluse, first at Fulda and afterwards at Mayence, where he seems to have composed his great work known as the *Chronicon*. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that he flourished certainly not less than 300 years after the death of St. Boniface, and hence can have no claim to the authority of a coeval writer.

In this *Chronicon*, under date of DCCXV (715), we have the following entry about Pope Gregory II.:—*Hic erat vir castus et sapiens, qui Bonifacium, patre atque etiam matre Scottum, ordinavit episcopum ad sedem Moguntinum, etc.*" Here we have a definite statement of the *original* scribe that Boniface was by father and mother of Irish *parentage*, but not precisely of Irish birth. The entry, by the way, is certainly in one respect inaccurate, for it was not Pope Gregory but Pope Zachary who made Boniface Archbishop of Mayence. During the life of Gregory that see was filled, and continued so until 745, when Gervilio was deposed for homicide and Boniface named by Pope Zachary to the vacant see. The expression, however, might perhaps be explained to mean that it was Gregory who ordained Boniface bishop—that Boniface who afterwards became Archbishop of Moguntinus.

In the *margin* of the MS. folio, and it would seem in a *different hand*, we have the following entry:—"Iste enim Bonifatius de Hibernia missus est cum Willibrordo Anglico episcopo ut in vita ejus Willibrordi legitur." This is, as we have said, a later entry on the margin and only goes to show Boniface was in Ireland before he came with Willibrord to Germany. It is admitted on all hands that though Willibrord was an Anglo-Saxon, he had studied in Ireland before his departure for the continent, where he was made bishop of Utrecht.

Several entries in the same *Chronicon* under the subsequent years, some in the original hand, and some in the margin, describe Boniface, and very pointedly too, as a Scottus, or Irishman. He is repeatedly spoken of as the Scotie Boniface—Bonifacium Scottum—so much so that it seems clear that the point was questioned at the time, and the Irish writer

of the Chronicon and his continuator meant to assert that Boniface was a fellow-countryman.

We fear this is the only original evidence that can be offered in favour of the Irish birth of Boniface. Trithemius is cited; but he merely quotes from Marianus Scotus, who was one of his chief authorities, and he cites more than once the Chronicon by name, showing clearly that he had that volume in his possession. Besides, the statement of a writer who flourished at the end of the fifteenth century is entitled to no special weight in fixing the birth-place of a man who flourished seven hundred years before his own time.

Dr. Moran cites the authorities quoted in Pertz's "*Monumenta Germaniae Historica*,"¹ vol. vii.; but these authorities, so far as we could ascertain, make no reference to the Irish birth of Boniface. We consulted all the references to Boniface in vol. vii., but the only one regarding his birth-place is the explicit statement made by a writer contemporary with Marianus Scotus, and a writer too of high authority, Magister Adamus Canonicus Bremensis, that "Winfridus," that is Boniface, "*erat natione Anglus, verus Christi philosophus . . . cui postea cognomentum erat ex virtute Bonifacius.*"

In our opinion there are many probable reasons which go to show that Boniface was not of Irish, but of Anglo-Saxon birth. His name Winfrid is certainly Anglo-Saxon. His associates in his apostolic labours in Germany—Burchard, Lullus, Willibald, Wunibald, and Wita—were, as their names imply, all, or nearly all, Anglo-Saxon, whom he appointed to the principal suffragan sees of Germany. His correspondence with Daniel, the Abbess Eadburga, the virgin Leobgitha (his cousin), Ebwald, King of the East Angles, Ethelbald, King of the Mercians, Ethelbert of Kent, as well as with several other eminent persons amongst the Anglo-Saxons, both male and female—all point to the fact that not only were his friends and associates to be found amongst the Saxons "beyond the sea," but that his associations, sympathies, and instincts all tended in the same direction. Moreover, if he were an Irishman, he certainly treated his

¹ See Pertz, Vol. vii., page 287. *Gesta Pontif. Eccles. Hammonb.*

fellow-countrymen with a harshness quite as singular as the sympathy which, in that hypothesis, he shows for the Anglo-Saxons. He was undoubtedly severe on Virgilius of Salzburg ; but Virgilius very clearly showed that, on the question of re-baptism, he was an abler theologian than Boniface, and on the question of the antipodes he was a sounder philosopher than Boniface, or any other man of his time. The latter also severely attacked another Irishman called Samson, of whom we know nothing else, on account of his alleged teaching that a man could become a Christian merely by the imposition of hands without baptism. We find Boniface also attacking Adalbert and Clement the Scot. Against the latter he brings several heinous charges before Pope Zachary¹ He was, according to Boniface, “*genere Scotus,*” and a “*hereticus publicus pessimus, et blasphemus contra Deum, etc.*” But when he comes to specify the charges in the end of his letter, it must be confessed that they are exceedingly vague, and rather of a moral than doctrinal character.

“*Alter autem hereticus qui dicitur Clemens, contra Catholicam contendit ecclesiam, et canones Ecclesiarum Christi abnegat et refutat, tractatus et sermones sanctorum patrum, Hieronymi, Augustini, Gregorii recusat. Synodalia jura spernens, proprio sensu affirmat se post duos filios sibi in adulterio natos sub nomine episcopi esse posse Christianae legis episcopum. Judaismum inducens judicat justum esse Christiano, ut si voluerit viduam fratris defuncti accipiat uxorem. Contra fidem sanctorum patrum quoque contendit, dicens, quod Christus Filius Dei, descendens ad inferos, omnes quos inferni carcer detinuit inde liberavit, credulos et incredulos, laudatores Dei simul et cultores idolorum et multa alia horribilia de prædestinatione Dei contraria fidei Catholicae affirmat.*”

Both Adalbert and Clement the Scot were condemned and imprisoned by Boniface, and afterwards condemned by Zachary in a Council held at Rome in 745, on the representations made by Boniface through one of his priests, Deneard, who was admitted to the Council, and read the letters of Boniface before the assembled fathers. It is a pity

¹ See Ep. LVII. apud Migne, *Patrol*, vol. 89.

that we have no means of ascertaining what Clement the Scot had to say in his own defence. It may be that he deserved the chastisement inflicted; but it may be, too, that these vague charges were as greatly exaggerated in his case as they undoubtedly were in the case of St. Virgilius of Salzburg.

"Clement, an Irish bishop," whom Alzog mentions (page 127, vol. ii.) is Clement the associate of Adalbert, to whom we have just now referred. What Boniface, however, says of him is not precisely that he was "an Irish bishop," but that he was "*genere Scottus*," and claimed to be a bishop notwithstanding his alleged crimes. He was certainly alive in 745, and can hardly be the same as the Claudius Clement referred to by Dr. Moran, who first came to France about 771, became teacher of the Palatine School, and afterwards Bishop of Auxerre. In making Clement Bishop of Auxerre, the Bishop of Ossory follows Usher, Colgan, and several other Irish writers. On the other hand, Mabillon, Lanigan, and the continental writers generally hold a different opinion.

Clement, the bishop of Irish birth, who was condemned by the Roman Council in 745, cannot with certainty be referred to any particular see. It is not unlikely, however, that he was the same Clement who about that time was Bishop of Auxerre, if we are to credit the Benedictine Annals (vol. iii., p. 63). Dr. Lanigan (vol. iii., p. 218), referring to that very passage, says that Mabillon makes it clear that Clement of Auxerre died in 738. In that case he certainly could not be identical with Clement the heretical Scot. But Dr. Lanigan is for once inaccurate in his own reference. What Mabillon says is to this effect, that Clement was bishop of Auxerre five years and one month; his successor, Aidulphus, was bishop fifteen years and some months, at whose death Maurinus became bishop *about* the year 768, which he takes as about the beginning of Charlemagne's reign. It is manifest, therefore, that there was a Bishop of Auxerre called Clement about the year 746 or 747, and it is highly probable that he was Clement the Scot.

The other and later Clement, who, according to the high authority of the Monk of St. Gall, an almost contemporary

writer, came to France about the time that Charles the Great became sole monarch, that is, about 771, cannot, we think, be proved from any early authority to have been Bishop of Auxerre. The name Claudius is sometimes prefixed to that of Clement, and he is called by several of our writers Claudius Clement. Lanigan thinks this arose from the fact that he was confounded with a very different person, who was, however, a teacher in the same school, Claudius, Bishop of Turin. We know of no ancient authority that gives the name Claudius to the Irish Clement, who founded the Palatine School some years before the English Alcuin came over to France. Dr. Moran, following Usher, seems to think that this Irish Claudius Clement was not only the Bishop of Auxerre, but also the author of the unpublished commentary on St. Mathew in the Vatican, and he appeals to the difference in the style of the introduction to that Gospel, which has been published by Mai, and the style of the preface or introduction prefixed by Claudius of Turin to his own commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, as well as to the designation *Claudii Scoti*, which Usher alleges is to be found in the heading of the Cambridge MS. of the Commentary on St. Mathew's Gospel.

Dr. Moran's opinion is entitled to the very greatest weight on a question of this kind; Lanigan, however, thinks that Claudius of Turin wrote the Exposition on St. Mathew as well as on the other parts of Scripture, and he says that the heading *Scoti* after *Claudii* may have been an interpolation by a later hand. The question, though interesting, is likely to remain for some time longer amongst the unsolved literary problems

THE HISTORIANS OF OSSORY.¹

KILKENNY has been described by one of its own illustrious sons as "the fair city on the banks of the crystal Nore, where, if anywhere, the Muse of Irish Catholic history has established a permanent shrine." This remark of Dr. Kelly, the late Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Maynooth College, is just and beautiful. We may add, too, that the Clio of the crystal Nore is of diviner birth than Jove's fabled daughter that haunted the Pierian Spring. Almost every century since it became the second city of the Pale, Kilkenny has produced or nurtured some distinguished ecclesiastical historian.

The list begins with John Clyn, a Friar Minor of the Franciscan Convent in Kilkenny whose Annals have been published by the Royal Archaeological Society.² He flourished during the first half of the fourteenth century, and wrote his Annals in Latin. The poor man seems to have found much difficulty in latinizing the uncouth Celtic names of the neighbouring tribes amongst the "Irish enemy," and hence it is not always easy to ascertain those to whom he refers. These Annals are especially full and valuable during his own lifetime, and he gives us much interesting information regarding the Palesmen of that period. He tells us, for instance, how in 1324, or, according to Grace, in 1325, the good people of Kilkenny had the satisfaction of seeing Dame Petronilla burnt for heresy and witchcraft. She was tried by Ledred, the Bishop, and Arnold Power, Seneschal of Kilkenny, with the sanction of the Justiciary of Ireland; and having been convicted of making charms from the brains of young children boiled in the skull of an executed thief, of offering sacrifice to the devil, and of similar nameless practices, she met her terrible fate at the stake.

¹ *The Analecta of David Rothe, Bishop of Ossory*, by Patrick F. Moran, Bishop of Ossory. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

² *Transactions of the Ossory Archaeological Society*. "Kilkenny Journal" Office.

Dame Kyteler and William Outlaw narrowly escaped at the same time. The former, according to the testimony of her accomplice Petronilla, used to "ride on an iron coulter whithersoever she willed through the world, without let or hindrance." The coulter must have helped her in the end; for had she not succeeded in escaping to England, she would certainly have shared the fate of Dame Petronilla. It was never heard of in time past that anyone was burnt for heresy in Ireland, says the chronicler; and it is a satisfaction to know that the actors in this dreadful tragedy were all, without exception, Anglo-Normans, both judges and victims; some of the latter were, it is said, connected with the highest families in the land.

Clyn gives us also a terribly graphic picture of a great plague that visited Kilkenny, like the rest of Ireland, in 1349:—"A year beyond measure, wonderful, unusual, and in many things prodigious;" and "a year in which the penitent and the confessor were carried together to the grave." The poor man writes as if he were living, as indeed he was, amongst the dead; for there was not a house, he says, without more than one dead in it. "I leave parchment," he adds, "for continuing this work (the Annals), if haply any man survive." He died, it seems, next year, in 1350.

John Grace, who appears to have been a Canon of the Augustinian Priory of St. John the Evangelist in Kilkenny, is said to have been the author of the Annals that bear his name; they have been also published by the Archæological Society. He flourished just before Henry VIII. confiscated the priory and the other religious houses in Kilkenny. His Annals, also written in Latin, are mainly interesting as genealogical records of the great Anglo-Norman families, to one of which he himself belonged. For we must bear in mind that during these centuries Kilkenny proper was a purely Anglo-Norman city, that grew up around the beautiful Cathedral of St. Canice, under the shadow of the proud keep of William, Earl Marechal. The Parliaments of the Pale were mostly held at Kilkenny. All its Bishops for three centuries, without exception, were Norman, the burgesses were Norman, even the friars in the convents were Norman.

Clyn and Grace speak of the "meere Irish" as if they were the Zulus of the period. The Norman families, that intermarried with the natives and used their language and dress, are the degenerate English, whom they hold in contempt. This was for three hundred years the tone of the pitiable colony in the Pale. They were bold warriors, but men of narrow hearts and scanty brains, who preferred to be taskmasters over herds of slaves rather than the great nobles of a free people. And this wretched spirit of hatred and disunion was steadily fostered by the English Government. Lionel, Duke of Clarence, found Kilkenny a suitable and sympathetic place to hold the Parliament that passed, in 1367, the infamous Statute of Kilkenny which the prelates and nobles of the Pale were not ashamed to sign. It was written in the barbarous Norman French of the time; it speaks throughout of "the Irish enemy"; it enacts the severest penalties against the degenerate English who would in any way associate with them. It was strictly forbidden by this atrocious Statute to take an Irish name, to speak the Irish language, to adopt any Irish custom, to wear the Irish dress, to entertain a travelling minstrel of the Irish race. It was treason to foster or intermarry with the Irish. The Brehon code was declared to be wicked and damnable. No mere Irishman might be promoted to any bishopric, canonry, abbacy, or parish; it was even forbidden to receive an Irishman into any of the religious houses of the Pale. And all this was enacted "for the good of religion, and the advancement of Holy Church, with the assent of the archbishops, bishops, abbots, and friars, as well as of the barons and commons of the said land of Ireland." Henry VIII. did many wicked acts, but it was not his worst act to turn gentlemen of this stamp out of the cathedrals and cloisters which they were unworthy to fill.

The days were now at hand when the Palesmen of Kilkenny were to be sorely tried by their English masters; and to do them justice they bore that trial well. Most of them remained loyal to the ancient faith. Community of suffering taught them sympathy for the Irish race which they had never known in the days of their prosperity. The Kilkenny of the

seventeenth century is as much above the Kilkenny of the fourteenth as David Rothe is above John Clyn. In 1641 the city of the Pale opened its hospitable gates to admit the delegates of Catholic Ireland, and the noble motto of the Confederation :—" Pro Deo, Rege, et Patria, Hiberni unanimes," showed that the exclusive spirit of the Pale was levelled as low as the earthen moat that once defended the colonists from the fierce attacks of the clansmen on the border.

In the next century, from 1759 to 1776, the See of Ossory was filled by the illustrious author of the *Hibernia Dominicana*, the brilliant writer and the sterling patriot, whose indignant narrative of his country's wrongs frightened the timid prelates of the Province to try and hold a meeting in his own city for the suppression, or at least the expurgation, of the book. However, De Burgo's determined attitude frightened them home again, and although some of the prelates afterwards met in Cashel and decreed the excision of a few just and eloquent pages about James II., still the Church of Ireland was spared the shame of censuring the noblest work ever inspired by the historical muse that loves the marble city by the " stubborn " Nore.

Next door to the house where De Burgo dwelt was born Dr. Mathew Kelly, the translator and annotator of Lynch's great work, *Cambrensis Eversus*. With his whole soul he loved the historical muse of Catholic Ireland. He did much, and was doing more for Irish History, when an early death, at the age of forty-four, snatched him from his labour of love, and blighted the high hopes that were centred in his labours. His first teacher was the Rev. M. A. Brennan, the author of the best arranged and most readable ecclesiastical history of Ireland that we have. Dr. Kelly died in October, 1858, and just three years later, in 1861, Dr. Moran, afterwards Bishop of Ossory, just now transferred to the Primatial See of Australia, published the first of a long series of most valuable works which show that the muse of Irish Catholic history still haunts the fair city on the banks of the crystal Nore. We need not specially refer to the many distinguished Irish historians whose names will be found in the pages of the Ossory Archæological Society, and of the

Kilkenny Archæological Society, now known as the Royal Historical and Archæological Association of Ireland.

Not the least valuable of Dr. Moran's contributions to the ecclesiastical history of Ireland is the republication of the *Analecta of David Rothe* and the valuable introduction which accompanies it. An excellent Memoir of David Rothe has been published by Dr. Moran in the very full and interesting account of the Bishops of Ossory, published in the second volume of the *Ossory Archæological Society*, of which Dr. Moran was the founder and guiding spirit. This Memoir is especially valuable because it gives many new facts, and corrects old errors regarding the history of the famous Confederation of Kilkenny.

David Rothe, author of the *Analecta*, was born at Kilkenny in the year 1568. His family were burgesses of Anglo-Norman origin, wealthy and respected. He studied at Douai and Salamanca, and subsequently went to Rome about 1602, where he became Secretary to Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Armagh, the president of the famous Congregation, *De Auxiliis*. Rothe came to Ireland in 1610, as Vicar Apostolic of Ossory and Vice-Primate of Ireland, for Lombard, who resided at Rome, delegated both his ordinary and primatial jurisdiction to his late secretary, with whose eminent merits he was well acquainted. Dr. Rothe was about to be appointed to the See of Ossory in 1613, but it was at the time deemed prudent to defer the actual appointment to a later date. It took place in 1618, and Rothe was towards the close of the same year consecrated in Paris. From his arrival in Ireland in 1610 to his death in 1650, as Bishop of Ossory and Vice-Primate, he was the central figure in Irish ecclesiastical history. His learning was immense, and his zeal was equal to his learning. Courage, too, was indispensable in those years of persecution; but courage without cautious prudence would have left the diocese without its pastor. He was greatly revered by the clergy of all ranks, and this reverence for his character and abilities lent great weight to his authority as judge and arbitrator in the many bitter ecclesiastical disputes that were composed mainly through his great learning, patience and charity. Like St. Paul, he had the

care of all the churches, he was anxious for all, and he laboured for all. In many dioceses there were no bishops, and the spiritual destitution was great ; but wherever it was greatest, there, at the risk of his life, in the woods and valleys, was Rothe, preaching, confirming, and absolving the afflicted Catholics to whom he came as an angel from heaven. He was zealous, too, for the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline, and in spite of the perils of the times, he presided as Vice-Primate for the Northern Province at a Synod held in 1618, in which many salutary decrees were enacted and enforced, so far as the circumstances of the time would permit. His hospitable house in Kilkenny was always open for the prelates of Leinster and Munster, and we find him present or presiding at Synods of Kilkenny in 1624 and 1629.

Besides his own literary labours, to which we shall presently refer, he lent effective assistance to Messingham, writing two Tracts for the *Florilegium*, one on the *Names of Ireland*, and the other a collection of *Notes or Elucidations*, as he called them, on the "Life of St. Patrick." He promised Luke Wadding to give every help in his power towards collecting those materials for our Irish hagiology, afterwards so well utilized by John Colgan. And Brother Michael O'Clery tells us, that nowhere did he receive a warmer welcome, when engaged in collecting these materials, than from Dr. Rothe of Ossory. Even Usher, in spite of his bigotry, was softened into complimentary language towards a Catholic bishop by Rothe's urbane scholarship, and he thanks "Dr. Rothe, a most diligent investigator of his country's antiquities," for lending him some MS. verses.

Dr. Rothe's attitude during the stormy period of the Confederation, was not uniformly consistent. It must be borne in mind that he was an Anglo-Norman, and a staunch loyalist, bound to obey the Pope's Nuncio as a bishop, but bound also to yield obedience to the crafty Ormond, the representative of King Charles. When these two were in direct opposition, it was not easy for Dr. Rothe to steer an even keel. He tried to do it, but, of course, he signally failed. At first he published the interdict, thereby adhering to the Nuncio ; then it was said the Jesuits got round him, showed

him that the interdict and other censures were invalid, and induced him to change his mind. It is, however, certain that he withdrew the interdict from the City of Kilkenny, gave favourable answers to the Queries of the Supreme Council, and formally sanctioned the Second Peace with Ormond, and the Truce with Inchiquin. "Resurgent Ireland" was again stricken down; the Concord of which they boasted was broken; Ireland, divided and paralysed by the treason of her own sons, became once more a victim to be lacerated by the Puritan wolves of Cromwell. Dr. Rothe, in his eighty-first year, weak in mind and body, saw the horizon of his beloved country growing darker and darker during the fatal year of 1649.

In January the king was beheaded at Whitehall. On the 22nd of February, Rinuccini sailed from Galway. On the 6th of August, the troops of Ormond, who were besieging Dublin, were chased from Rathfarnham by Jones's Puritan soldiers, and Ormond himself fled home, as fast as his horse could carry him, to hide his shame or his treason. On the 20th of the same month of August, Cromwell landed in Dublin with 12,000 veterans, and with him came a fearful plague that swept away nearly a third of the population in the cities. On the 5th of November, a wail of woe was heard through all the North—Ireland's latest hope was gone, for Owen Roe O'Neil, her sword and her buckler, lay dead at Cloughouter, in Cavan. Cromwell was now free to range throughout the land on his tour of slaughter. He came to Kilkenny about the 22nd of March, 1650. The city surrendered after a stubborn defence, and the poor old bishop saw, before he died, his churches profaned, his clergy massacred, his faithful flock outraged, insulted or slain. He was, it is said, himself dragged to prison, until death mercifully came to end the miseries of the old man sometime towards the close of 1650.

Dr. Rothe's greatest work is the *Analecta*. Dr. Moran declares that it is by far the most important historical work which any member of the Irish Hierarchy had, up to the time of its appearance, contributed to our literature. The first part was published in 1616. A new and complete edition in two volumes, appeared at Cologne, 1617 and 1619. The

first incomplete edition was dedicated to Charles, Prince of Wales, in a Dedicatory Letter which, in our days, would be denounced by irreverent patriots as fulsome flattery of the worthless Stuarts. But Kilkenny was a city of the Pale, eminently loyal even to persecuting princes—perhaps a trifle too ready to lick the hands that smote them. The full title of this first edition gives a summary of the contents of the work. He called it :—“ *Analecta Sacra Nova et Mira de Rebus Catholicorum in Hibernia pro fide et religione gestis, divisa in tres partes, quarum*

Prima, quae nunc datur, continet Semestrem gravaminum Relationem ;

Secunda, Paraenisin ad martyres designatos ;

Tertia, Processum Martyrialem quorundum fidei pugilum ; Relatore et Collectore T.N.” In the second edition it was “ T. N. Philadelpho.” The author, of course, dare not give his name without exposing himself to the vengeance of the Irish Government.

Dr. Rothe tells us that he called the first part, published in 1616, a *Semestris gravaminum Relatio*, partly because it was written in six months, which shows that the writer had a very ready pen, and partly because the fines and other pains and penalties imposed on recusants were renewed every six months. This first part certainly contains a moving tale of the infamous wrongs inflicted on Catholics, not only during the later years of Elizabeth’s reign, but up to the very time that Dr. Rothe was writing. The second part, as its name implies, is a touching exhortation addressed, about the year 1611, to the Bishop of Down and Connor, Cornelius O’Devany, and to other confessors, who were in prison for the faith throughout Ireland. Some of them, as Dr. Rothe elsewhere says, were packed into the poisonous jails, “ like herrings in a barrel.”

The third, and much the most valuable part of the *Analecta*, sets forth with great minuteness of detail the terrible and prolonged sufferings of the three illustrious martyrs, Richard Creagh, Archbishop of Armagh, Patrick O’Healy, Bishop of Mayo, and Dermod O’Hurley, Archbishop of Cashel, as well as of several other martyrs and

confessors who suffered during the reign of Elizabeth. This *Processus Martyrialis* is a work of great authority, coming from a contemporary writer whose means of obtaining accurate information were ample, and whose veracity cannot be impugned. Some of the details given by Dr. Rothe have been questioned or denied by later Protestant writers. It was a fortunate circumstance, for it has elicited from Dr. Moran, in the Introduction, a brilliant vindication of the facts narrated by his illustrious predecessor in the See of Ossory, and upon evidence which cannot be gainsayed—the official Records of the State Papers, drawn up by the very men who perpetrated these legal murders. We regret that we cannot now find space to give some specimens of Dr. Moran's triumphant vindication of Rothe's historical accuracy; we must refer our readers to the book itself, which will amply repay perusal.

Students of Irish history owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Moran for the republication and vindication of this valuable historical treatise: but it is only one of the great services which he has rendered to the historical literature of Ireland. From the last twenty-three years, the Bishop of Ossory has published no less than thirteen different works on Irish ecclesiastical history, besides writing many valuable papers on the same subject for the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, of which he was for several years the editor and chief contributor. His labours have entitled him to high rank among the illustrious sons of Ireland, who for no earthly reward spent many toilsome years in vindicating the glories of our National Church. He is one of those who, as David Rothe has well said, preferred to consult for the honour of their country, the glory of their ancestors, and the instruction of posterity, rather than for their own security and ease. His name will go down to future ages with the Rothes, the Waddings, the Colgans, the O'Clerys, and the other sons of Ireland, who have shed so much lustre on their native land. Now, in obedience to the call of the Church's Ruler, he leaves the fair city which the Muse of History loves, to govern the archiepiscopal see of Sydney, to which is annexed the Primacy of the Australian Empire. He goes out at the call of God into a

strange land ; but he goes in the spirit of the Irish *peregrini* of old, not without regret, but with courage and confidence withal, to work the work of God.

The Record bids him a hearty God speed on his distant journey. May St. Cormac the Sailor, and his own St. Brendan, who so often tried the perils of the stormy seas, send him prosperous breezes to waft him to his southern home ; and may all the Saints of Erin help him by their strong prayers to build up in Australia an Irish Church, that in the coming time will rival in sanctity and learning the unforgotten glories for the ancient church of Ireland.¹

¹ This review appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, May, 1884.

POPE LEO XIII. ON THE ORIGIN OF THE CIVIL POWER.

THE Latin text of Pope Leo XIII.'s Encyclical on the origin and nature of the Civil Power, was published in one of our recent numbers.¹ Latin documents, however, even on the most important subjects, are not very attractive; hence we think it well to call the attention of our readers to some very noteworthy statements in this most interesting and valuable document.

It is unnecessary to observe that a Papal Encyclical addressed to the Prelates of the Catholic Church, is, on account of its high and sacred authority, entitled to the assent and obedience of all the children of the Church. And this is true even when it pronounces no *definite* sentence *ex cathedra* on questions of faith and morals, which would be necessarily infallible. The obedience of our internal assent, at least as to the *security* of the doctrine put forward, is due to the supreme teaching authority, according to the nature of its pronouncements, when the Supreme Pastor on any question connected with faith or morals, admonishes, advises, censures, or forbids the propagation of any dangerous or erroneous doctrines or opinions.²

In the opening paragraph of this Encyclical the Pope justly observes that the impious war so long waged against the Church has now received its natural development, in being directed against the State also. After having referred to some of the atrocious attempts on the lives of sovereigns that have lately shocked the public conscience of all Europe, he declares that in these circumstances he deems it his duty to remind the Prelates of what Catholic truth teaches regarding

¹ This paper appeared in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, December, 1881.

² See Franzelin, whom we merely paraphrase, *De Trad.* Thesis 12, Coroll. 5, and again Eadem Thesis, Princip. 7, Coroll. 3, where he declares: "Licet non ex cathedra definiti sed *prescribenti* doctrinam aliquam sequendam vel non, debetur obedientia et mentis obsequium ad judicandam doctrinam esse (saltem) securam."

(a) the origin of the Civil Power, (b) the reciprocal duties of rulers and subjects, (c) as well as the best means to consult for the common interests of Church and State in the future

It cannot be questioned that this is a theme of great gravity and that the teaching and the counsels of the Ruler of Christendom deserve the serious attention, not only of all Catholics, but of all thinking men. We invite the especial attention of our readers to the opening paragraph, in which the Pope explains the origin of the Civil Power.

He begins by stating what, as far as we know, has never been seriously questioned by any true statesman or philosopher, except J. J. Rousseau, that no community can exist without government, and that social life is a necessity of our human nature. Thus far even pagan philosophers¹ have agreed with the teaching of the Church. But what is the origin of this civil government? It was always regarded by Christians as divine down to the sixteenth century, when new theories in Church and State began to be broached; these theories were amplified by the so-called philosophers of more recent times, who, amongst other errors, maintain that Civil Power derives its origin from the people, that the rulers of the State must not regard this power as their own, but as intrusted to them by the people, and only on this condition, that it shall be revocable at the will of the people. Such, however, says the Pope, is not the belief of Catholics, who derive the right of governing—*jus imperandi*—from God, as from its natural and necessary principle. We call the especial attention of our readers to the paragraph which follows, of which we give also the Latin original.²

¹ See Aristotle Libro, i., *De Pol.* et Lib. x., *De Ethicis*; also Plato *De Resp.* et Cicero *De Finibus et de Legibus*.

² "Interest autem attendere hoc loco, eos qui reipublicae praefuturi sint posse in quibusdam causis voluntate judicioque deligi multitudinis, non adversante neque repugnante doctrina Catholica. Quo sane delectu, designatur princeps, non conferuntur jura principatus; neque mandatur imperium, sed statuitur a quo sit gerendum. Neque hic quaeritur de rerum publicarum modis; nihil enim est cur non Ecclesiae probetur aut unius aut plurium principatus, si modo justus sit et in communem utilitatem intentus. Quamobrem, salva justitia non prohibentur populi illud sibi genus comparare reipublicae, quod aut ipsorum ingenio, aut majorum institutis moribusque magis apte conveniat."

"Now it is important to observe here, that those who may rule the State can *in certain cases* be selected by the will and judgment of the people, and that herein Catholic doctrine offers neither dissent nor opposition. By this vote, however, the ruler is determined, but the right of governing is not conferred; supreme authority is not thereby passed, only the person who is to exercise it is named. Neither do we here inquire into the various forms of government; for there is no reason why the rule of one or of many should not be sanctioned by the Church, provided only it be just in itself, and exercised for the benefit of the commonwealth. Wherefore nations can with perfect justice select that form of government which is best suited to their own character, or to their traditional habits and institutions."

This is a very important paragraph, it is most carefully worded, and coming from the supreme teaching authority in the Church it deserves the very greatest attention. Let us then examine its import carefully.

In the first place, it must be borne in mind that all power comes from God. This assertion is, and always was, of Catholic faith; and hence to say that the Civil Power comes from the people, is, as it stands, simply an heretical proposition, for it formally contradicts the Apostle who declares that there is no power unless from God.¹ This great truth of our Catholic faith is specially insisted upon in the present Encyclical; for the Pope repeatedly affirms it under various forms of speech. "God," he says, "is the natural and necessary principle of authority in Civil Government;" and again, "the Church teaches that Civil Power comes from God." The next paragraph declares that "God is the fountain of all human authority;" and elsewhere, "the origin of all power and dominion is derived from one and the same Creator and Lord of the Universe." It is unnecessary to multiply quotations from the Sacred Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church to prove this primary truth of Christian morality and Catholic faith. Yet it is sometimes forgotten by persons, otherwise well-meaning, who are too much accustomed to the inaccurate and unorthodox language of English literature, to use that sound form of words in which the Catholic teaching should be expressed.

But in the paragraph above referred to, the Pope goes much farther than simply saying that the Civil Power comes

¹ *Rom.* xiii. 1.

from God. He appears to us to say very distinctly, that it is in no sense of the word derived from the people either ultimately or immediately. That the Civil Power is not from the people ultimately is of Catholic faith ; that it is not immediately from the people, although ultimately from God, is certainly not of faith ; nor does the Pope intend to teach it as of Catholic faith in the paragraph we have quoted ; at least such is our opinion. It must be borne in mind that neither Popes nor Councils, as a rule, intend to pronounce a final decision on free questions of theology, except the contrary is clearly expressed. And certainly the opinion which teaches that Civil Power is immediately from the people, although in the abstract and ultimately it is derived from God, has hitherto, and is still, we think, a perfectly free opinion ; for it has been maintained by Suarez, Bellarmine, and other theologians of less name ; and in more popular books the same view has been often advocated, as by Balmez in his *History of European Civilization*.

But we think the present Encyclical deals a serious blow at the probability of that opinion, and indeed, in the face of the Pope's language, we do not see how it can henceforward be maintained amongst theologians with any show of probability. As the matter is of considerable importance, we shall examine it more closely.

On the question of the nature and origin of the Civil Power there are four writers of pre-eminent authority—Suarez, St. Thomas, St. Augustine, and St. Chrysostom. We take them, not in the order of merit, but in the backward order. Suarez discusses the question both in his treatise *On Laws*, and in a special work written “in defence of the Catholic faith against the errors of the Anglican sect.” In the opening chapters of the third book of this treatise, the reader will find a full and accurate exposition of the origin and nature of the Civil Power. James I. of England, who set up to be a theologian as well as a philosopher, had written a severe attack on Cardinal Bellarmine's doctrine touching the so-called divine right of kings and their inferiority to the Pope. Thereupon Suarez, after the death of Bellarmine, entered the lists against the royal pedant, in defence of the

great Cardinal of his Order, and certainly left James no ground to boast of victory. On the present question James maintained the divine right pure and simple; Suarez, following Bellarmine, denies this right, and furthermore maintains that the royal authority is derived from God through the people.

St. Thomas discusses also the origin and duties of the Civil Government, in a treatise addressed to the King of Cyprus, probably Hugo III., entitled *De Regimine Principum*. The treatise, as we have it, contains four books; but the last two, although frequently quoted on this very question as the work of St. Thomas, are of doubtful authenticity. The first two, however, except a small portion of the second book at the end, are undoubtedly genuine, and are referred to by the Pope in the present Encyclical.

The references of St. Augustine to this question are contained chiefly in his great treatise *De Civitate Dei*; while St. Chrysostom testifies to the doctrine of the Greek Church in his 24th Homily on the *Epistle to the Romans*, as well as in the 34th on the *Epistle to the Corinthians*.

It is not unknown to our readers that Rousseau in his *Emile*, and the treatise *Du Contract Social*, teaches the strange doctrine that the solitary state is natural to man, that therein alone he is truly happy, that society is a purely artificial state, resulting from a free compact amongst its individual members, and that the vices and crimes resulting from this unnatural condition of mankind are the real obstacles to human happiness.

Other writers, without adopting the extreme views of Rousseau, admit his doctrine, in so far as it tells us that society is the outcome of a perfectly free compact; that its members for their own better security have agreed to forfeit a portion of their individual liberty and independence in order to secure more efficient protection for their persons and properties. To carry out the terms of the compact, government is necessary; but the consenting parties are the true and ultimate source of the authority thus delegated to their rulers, and consequently can withdraw, modify, or annul not only the delegated authority itself, but also the

terms of the original compact. This last point is not always explicitly put forward as a part of their system, but it logically follows as an inevitable consequence, for the consent of the contracting parties can always dissolve a merely human compact; and certainly one generation of men cannot by any act of theirs bind any subsequent generation.

Very different, indeed, is Catholic teaching regarding the origin of Civil Society. In the opening chapter of the treatise on the "Government of Princes," St. Thomas very beautifully explains the divine origin of the Civil Power, as well as of human society, reasoning as usual in singularly clear and cogent language.

Man, he says, being a rational animal has necessarily some end to which his whole life and activity are to be directed, and this natural end is peace, and the happiness which follows peace. Now, if man, were to be alone he could not attain this end, for he could not procure the means of gratifying even the most urgent wants—food, shelter, clothing, and protection. Nature has in these respects left him almost helpless, quite dependent on the aid of his fellow-men. Outside of society he cannot perfect his natural gifts; he has little or no use for speech; he could find no exercise for his sympathies; he could not share his happiness, even if he possessed it, with others; and, thus life would lose its greatest charm. In fact, left to himself he would be little better than a ferocious savage. Thus man's natural inclinations, his weakness, his wants, his endowments, all point distinctly to the fact that God made him for society, and that only in society he can attain his end, which is peace and happiness.

Society, therefore, is not the result of a voluntary compact, but a necessity of our human nature. Men cannot, never could, except in a few isolated cases, exist unless in society. The social compact is a pure figment, we do not find it in history, we cannot ascertain it by reason. The true historical origin of society dates from the family, which is of divine institution; from God is derived all paternity in heaven and on earth. From many families of the same descent uniting together we get patriarchal or tribal society; and

from the union of several tribes under one head, it may be of their own choosing, we come to the perfect community, which is complete and self-sufficing for its own protection.

No society, however, can exist without rulers ; it exists for a definite purpose, and the attainment of that purpose requires efficient and intelligent guidance. The multitude of wills, with varying wants and wishes and interests, would rend society asunder, instead of enabling it to attain its end, if left to themselves for any length of time. Thus we have the sorites of St. Thomas, which is briefly this—man by nature seeks happiness ; he cannot have happiness except in society ; he cannot have society without rulers ; and as God is the author of man's nature, so He is also the source and sanction of that Civil government which is a necessity of his nature, for whenever He fixes the end, He also furnishes the necessary means to its attainment. Thus it is that as the power of a father in his family, of a husband over his wife, are both divine and cannot be forfeited or annulled even by the will of the parties concerned, so also the power of the ruler in the State is from God and not from man, and can only be forfeited in those cases determined by the law of God.

Thus far all Catholic Theologians, all the Fathers of the Church, the sacred writers in the Old and New Testaments, declare with one voice that there is no power unless from God, that it is through Him that sovereigns rule, and princes judge justly, and, therefore, he who resists the power resists the ordinance of God. He does not, says St. Chrysostom, say that the individuals are chosen by God, but that the thing itself is from Him, therefore he who bears it is the minister of God, and as such is entitled to obedience for conscience sake.

As a rule, the Fathers of the Church, and the earlier theologians stop here ; they were content with emphatically asserting the divine origin of the Civil Power, but later writers have raised a very important question ; the power they all admit comes from God, but in whom does it *immediately* vest ? Does it vest in the whole body of the community, from whom it passes to the rulers, when they are chosen or determined ? or does the community merely possess the right of selecting the ruler and determining the

form of government so that when this is done the authority vests immediately in the rulers, without passing at all through the hands of the people? This is a very important question, and is very differently answered.

According to Suarez, Bellarmine, and many other writers of great name, the power comes immediately from God, *but primarily vests in the people*, not in the people as units, nor even in the people as a mere aggregate of units, but in the entire body politic. “*Suprema potestas civilis*,” he says, “*soli communitati perfectae immediate a Deo confertur*.” Which he explains by saying, “*Primo enim suprema potestas civilis, per se spectata, immediate quidem data est a Deo hominibus in civitatem seu perfectam communitatem congregatis, non quidem ex peculiari et quasi positiva institutione vel donatione omnino distincta a productione talis naturae, sed per naturalem consecutionem ex vi primæ creationis ejus, ideoque ex vi talis donationis non est haec potestas in una persona neque in peculiari congregatione multarum, sed in toto perfecto populo seu corpore communitatis*.”¹

He adds that this is the common opinion of a large number of theologians and canonists, whom he cites. Further on, in No. 17, he says, “*Neque sufficit designatio personae, neque est separabilis a donatione vel contractu, aut quasi contractu humano, ut habeat effectum conferendi potestatem. . . . Unde intelligi non potest collatio potestatis, quae a Deo immediate fiat media generatione, electione, aut simili designatione humana, nisi ubi successio est ex divina institutione positiva, potestas autem regia non ex divina institutione positiva, sed solum ex ratione naturali ducit originem, media libera voluntate humana, et ideo necessario est ab homine immediate conferente et non tantum personam designante*.”

It is manifestly impossible to reconcile the statement in the last sentence with the words of the Encyclical—“*Quo sane delectu designatur princeps, non conferuntur jura principatus; neque mandatur imperium sed statuitur a quo sit gerendum*.”

¹ Lib. iij., c. ii. n. 5.

Suarez, as might be expected, defends his opinion with great ingenuity, yet we think in this question the controversial spirit must have led him astray. For how could this power vest immediately in the entire body politic, seeing that the entire body could never possibly exercise it? God is not in the habit of giving a power which cannot be exercised and even if we admit that in extreme cases the whole community could exercise the legislative, it is utterly impossible that it could ever exercise the executive, or judicial power. Besides, there is no such thing as a body politic "complete and perfect," as Suarez supposes, without rulers of some kind, any more than you can have a human body without a head. You have an aggregate of units but no body politic, no community, no society, in the formal sense of the word.

But Suarez says, the aggregate of individuals forms as it were the matter, the power is the form which completes them as a perfect community. He may possibly *conceive* it as such, and in his conception make this separation, but where, since the beginning of the world, did any perfect society exist as such without rulers? for a perfect society is self-sufficing for the attainment of its end, and, therefore, necessarily implies a ruling power. And all Scripture and tradition declare that it is the rulers, not the society, to whom God gives the power. In the older writers, we do not meet with this distinction at all. All the Fathers simply declare with St. Paul, that the power comes from God, that the rulers are the ministers of God, that reverence is due to them for conscience sake, and so on; but not one syllable can be found to the effect that God gave this power to the body of the people, to society as a whole, or anything of the kind. These ideas have been the growth of a later theology, which attempts to reconcile the doctrine of the Church with the so-called rights of the people.

Moreover, this doctrine, which vests the people with the God-given power of ruling, is open to grave abuses. In truth it seems to lend countenance to the idea, the fatal and destructive idea, that the ruler is merely the delegate of the people, and, therefore, that the power is validly

revocable at the will of the people. It is true Suarez vehemently denies this inference when choice is made of a ruler ; he says, the power is transferred, not delegated, and is not, therefore, revocable during the period assigned by the terms of the original constitution, at least so long as the ruler acts justly. But it is hard to find a parallel case in which the holder of supreme power despoils himself completely and transfers it altogether. He may abdicate, but he cannot transfer with the right of resumption after a certain time—at least it is not easy to find any instance of the kind.

Another inconvenience following from this doctrine is, that if it were true, Democracy pure and simple, if such a thing were possible, would be the only government existing by divine right ; for, according to Suarez, Democracy was the only form of government to which God gives immediately the power of ruling, not its subjects, but itself ; for a Democracy pure and simple could have no subjects but the people, and thus the people would be at once subjects and rulers, their own subjects and their own rulers, which is somewhat inconvenient. In a wider sense of the word, a man may be said to rule himself when he rules his own passions, and the State governs itself when it has the right of choosing its governors ; but this is clearly said only in the metaphorical, and not in the strict sense of the word.

Quite different is the origin of the Civil Power, as put forward in this Encyclical. *It comes to the rulers immediately from God.* In certain cases, it is true, the community has the right of choosing the ruler, or rulers, and of determining the form of government. They may, as they think proper, choose monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy ; or it may, like our own, be a mixed government, in which the three elements are combined in harmonious proportions. But it is one thing to choose the rulers, and another to grant the power ; the people have the right of doing the former, God alone can do the latter. Of its own nature, this power cannot be in the gift of the people, either as the original depositaries, or temporary custodians. As the Pope points out, its exercise involves acts which are utterly beyond the competence of the multitude. The people cannot, for instance, grant the

right of taking human life as a punishment for past crimes. The law of nature indeed gives every individual the right of taking human life, when it is the only means of defending his own life against an actual aggressor ; but the law of nature gives no single individual, or no aggregate of individuals, the right of taking human life in punishment of a past crime. In that case, the right would result from a formal or virtual compact amongst the members of the community, but this is impossible, for as the individual has no dominion over his own life, he cannot by any agreement authorize others to take that life in certain circumstances. To authorize, therefore, the taking away of human life needs divine authority, and consequently cannot come from the community as such. The multitude is not, therefore, the original depositary of this power, neither are they the immediate recipients, because it would be useless and unmeaning to give them a power which they could never exercise.

Again, all human laws bind some way in conscience. Even purely penal laws bind delinquents to accept the penalty when it is imposed, so that resistance, even if successful, would be a mortal sin in *re gravi*. But no merely human power can bind in conscience ; the State if it had no divine authority and sanction, could not touch the conscience, could not cause the delinquent to become guilty of a crime in the sight of God by the transgression of its laws. But now, whether the ruler wills to bind in conscience or not, nay even against his express will, his laws have this binding power, because he is only the minister of God, he rules in virtue of the power of God, and the man who breaks his laws necessarily breaks the ordinances of God. This doctrine is so clearly put forward both by St. Peter and St. Paul that it cannot for a moment be questioned by Christians ; it is explicitly revealed. It matters little whether the ruler be good or bad, Christian or Pagan, Catholic or Protestant, he is still entitled to the obedience of his subjects, for he is still the minister of God. " God," says St. Augustine, " because He alone is the true God, gives earthly kingdoms both to good and bad ; happiness, however, He gives only to the good." And, again having spoken of Nero's cruelty and

impiety, he adds "yet even to such the power of ruling is given only by the Providence of the Supreme God, when He judges that human affairs deserve such a ruler."

The Pope very justly says it is only in certain cases that the people has the right of selecting the ruler and fixing the form of government; that is to say only at the origin of the State, or when, from some extraordinary combination of events, the State is left without any rulers with a title to obedience. When, however, the form of the government has in these circumstances been once fixed, and the ruler is chosen then he gets his power to rule from God and consequently retains it according to the terms of the constitution so long as he acts justly. Whilst the rulers do so it is no longer within the competence of the people to modify the form of government, or get rid of their rulers. Any other doctrine would be subversive of society, and is manifestly false, seeing that if the power comes from God, the ruler necessarily holds that power so long at least as he acts justly and within the limits of the constitution. This doctrine is equally true whether it be understood of absolute or limited monarchy, and whether the Sovereign power be hereditary, elective for life, or for a definite number of years.

This is the divine right of kings, in the true sense of the word, but it is also the divine right of consul, dictator, or president, precisely in the same sense during the legal tenure of their office. Hence we do not by any means understand the word in the sense in which it has been so often abused by Anglican divines of the old Tory type and French theologians of the Gallican School, who, whilst they unduly restricted the liberties of the Church, gave hereditary monarchs an absolute, divine, and indefeasible right to rule the State. It does not appear that hereditary monarchy, as such, has any *especially* divine character; that may be, as St. Thomas teaches, the better form of Government, probably is in certain cases, and originally seems to have been the usual form because the best suited to primitive and comparatively rude populations. But monarchy is not of specially divine institution, it is not necessarily nor in all cases usefully absolute in authority; and certainly is not indefeasible in its right to rule. This is

not the place to discuss that question, but St. Thomas expressly teaches that kings may forfeit their divine right by intolerable oppression of their subjects, and there can hardly be a doubt but other causes also might entail in certain circumstances a similar forfeiture, for instance utter incapacity to rule, or the persistent violation of the fundamental principles of the constitution.

We give, therefore, the same divine right to all just rulers as to hereditary monarchs ; they have their power equally from God, when they have once been designated or elected by the people ; they are entitled to the same obedience, and to the same reverence. No doubt, in the popular imagination, an aureola of accidental glory will gild the brows of the descendant of an ancient line of kings, and the monarch's character becomes still more venerable when the Pontiff anoints his head with the sacred oil. But all this, although natural and becoming, is still purely accidental ; the elected and unconsecrated ruler is all the same the minister of God, equally entitled to reverence and obedience.

This, we think, is the true way to explain the divine origin of the Civil Power ; and, as the Pope justly observes, this view of his authority lends to the civil ruler a dignity and majesty which tend to preserve the strength and peace of nations, as well as to secure the personal safety of the rulers themselves. Their character, according to this view, is sacred ; their persons are inviolable ; they are the anointed of the Lord, if not with sacred oil, at least by virtue of their office. Their power is " broad-based " upon the will of God, and not on the shifting sands of the people's will. They are the servants, not of the people—

" The herd, wild hearts, and feeble wings,
That every sophister can lime—"

but the servants of the Most High. They will be spoken of with becoming reverence, instead of being in public estimation the fitting butts for all foul tongues. It becomes a sacrilege to violate their persons, and every indignity offered to them in word or act becomes an indignity offered to God Himself. It is this view of kingly rule that alone can keep alive in a

scoffing and licentious age the spirit of ancient loyalty, that spirit begotten of faith, combining in itself obedience, reverence, and love for the majesty of kings, which was at once a bond of social union, an incentive to noble daring, and a salt to purify the heart from its grosser tendencies, preserving it from all that is mean, selfish, and contemptible. Such was loyalty in the Ages of Faith, when men swore, and kept their oath to reverence the king, as if he were—"their conscience, and their conscience as their king."

A PILGRIMAGE TO INNISMURRY.

THE tourist who has ever travelled the highly picturesque road from Sligo to Bundoran, which runs between Benbulbin Mountains and the sea, cannot fail to have noticed the island of Innismurry. Long and low-lying, it looks in the distance like a huge raft at anchor in the broad waters of the noble bay of Donegal. Being very difficult of access, it is seldom visited by strangers, and yet few ancient sanctuaries ought to be more interesting to the churchman and antiquarian. It is undoubtedly one of the very earliest of the Irish monastic retreats. Here the great Columba spent his youth before he went to found the more famous Iona; here was a School of Saints before St. Kyran laid the first stone of Clonmacnoise in the green meadows by the Shannon side. More than thirteen hundred years have passed since St. Molaise first built his church and cell in this desolate island; time and the spoiler's hand have not spared these venerable ruins, but the shadow of its ancient holiness is around the island still. The lowly cells, built of dry stones, the broken cross, the small stone-roofed churches, the ancient Irish inscriptions on the tombs, bring back the mind to the very infancy of the Irish Church and the dawn of her ecclesiastical architecture. And it is purely Catholic still. No Protestant lives there or is buried there, no church of the new worship desecrates the resting-place of these early Irish saints.

The writer with a few friends, paid a visit to Innismurry on the 21st of last September.¹ A brief account of what they saw may not be uninteresting.

The morning selected for our expedition was dry and cloudy, with a rather stiff breeze coming down from the Leitrim Mountains on the south-east. "Fine day, sir," said an old sailor, "for going to the island; but you will want to be

¹ This paper appeared in the *Irish Monthly* for June, 1877.

waterproof if you expect to come home dry." Some old salts even hinted it would be more prudent to defer our visit ; but the ladies—at least the younger ones—were courageous, and how could the gentlemen show the white feather ?

The bay of Donegal is fickle and dangerous, owing chiefly to the high mountains and deep valleys that surround it. We started from Mullaghmore, the most beautiful watering place on the western coast. The lodges are few, but the accommodation is excellent, so that all who spend one season in Mullaghmore are anxious to come again. Besides its great natural beauties it has the advantage of an excellent harbour and breakwater, constructed by the late Lord Palmerston for the benefit of the fishermen at a cost of some £30,000 from his private resources. He was a truly excellent landlord ; he established and endowed national schools, built a glebehouse, and gave a free farm to the parish priest ; and even when guiding the diplomacy of Europe (not always in the right direction), the meanest of his tenantry, if he had just cause of complaint, was certain to receive prompt and speedy justice by the autograph orders of the busy statesman—a policy which his successors still faithfully carry out.

We had a rather small yacht for our voyage across to the island, but our party was also small—three ladies, two gentlemen, and two sailors—both, fortunately for us, men of coolness, courage and skill. Shooting like an arrow from her moorings, the little craft soon rounded the bold promontory of Mullaghmore, the quickening breeze and the rising sea compelling us to shorten sail somewhat precipitately. Yet no sooner had we rounded the point than we had a short interval of calm under the lee of the huge cliffs, which gave us leisure to admire the beautiful residence lately erected by Mr. Cooper Temple. It stands upon a rock almost overhanging the sea, and is surrounded by long reaches of swelling sand hills, with the "hollow ocean ridges roaring into cataracts" just under the windows. Altogether this splendid residence commands what is, perhaps, the finest prospect of ocean and mountain scenery in Ireland. But the darkening water and the whitening wave crests soon warned us of the coming breeze, and a lively one it proved to be for the rest of

the day. Our little craft seemed to fly before it swifter than the cloud-shadows racing down from the mountains :—

“Ocyor cervo, et agente nimbos
Ocyor Euro.”

The foam-showers at intervals swept over us as we rushed onwards with our deck listed to an angle of 45° , and the water boiling over our gunwale, exciting and pleasant to people waterproof and strong-nerved, but rather alarming to those new to the sea. However, after a run of about eleven miles in little more than an hour, we cast anchor quite close to the island in twelve fathoms of water.

Even in the finest weather it is no easy matter to land on Innismurry without assistance from the shore ; but when the sea is “ up,” it is well nigh impossible. The entire island is composed of a huge granite rock, against whose steep sides, a restless and angry ocean is ever dashing. The islanders, however, recognising the priest on board, came to our assistance and took us ashore in one of their fishing-boats, landing us in a deep and narrow gully between two huge overhanging rocks. With the aid of their strong arms we succeeded, not without difficulty, in clambering over the horrid crags and huge misshapen boulders that blocked up the passage.

The entire population generally turns out to receive what they consider to be visitors of distinction. All came to meet us, young and old, men, women, and children, clad in rather primitive and scanty raiment. The dress of the men consists generally of coarse woollen vest and trousers, the women have somewhat differently shaped garments of the same material, while the gender of most of the juveniles, as far as their dress gave indication thereof, was decidedly epicene.

The seaward side of the island affords the finest prospect. Sea and sky and mountain all combine to lend their charms. The aspect of the place itself is naked and bare ; not a tree, or even a shrub, is to be seen ; but the eye never tires of the glorious presence of the far-reaching sea, framed on three sides by noble mountains. Due north is the serrated ridge of south-western Donegal, terminating in the bold promontory of Slieve-Liag—the Gray Mountain—whose perpendicular

cliffs, nature's rampart against the wild Atlantic, rise a thousand feet in height from water thirty fathoms deep. The sun lit up the dark caverns of this mighty sea-wall, making them shine like palaces of white marble built upon the waves. According to Professor Hull, this is the father of Irish Mountains, having emerged from the sea countless ages before even the Alps or Pyrenees raised their heads from their cradles in the deep. To the south, the Benbulbin range, unique in beauty, throws out four bold spurs to the sea, as if to contest the palm for pride of place with their older brethren of the northern shore. Then, westward, in the dim distance, can be seen Nephin and Croagh Patrick rising in solitary grandeur, and the Stags of Broad Haven resting like cloud shadows on the "ultimate sea."

A well filled hamper always improves the æsthetic enjoyment of scenery, especially after a sea voyage. So we set ourselves down on the rocks to eat, and admire at our leisure ; our noble hostess supplying us with the viands which the *mal de mer* would not let her touch herself. We keep, however, at a safe distance from those huge green waves that come racing and swelling onward like living things, and leap against the rocks at our feet with angry roar, only to be flung back in those showers of foam gleaming many-hued in the sunshine.

The island contains about 130 acres of shallow soil, partly cut-away bog, with a stiff subsoil of what looks like impure iron ore. The arable portion—about a fourth of the whole—produces scanty and precarious crops of barley, potatoes, and rye. The population numbers about ninety-six souls, all Catholics, besides a garrison of four or five policemen, who are kept on the island at a cost of about £300 a year, to prevent the illicit distillation of whiskey, for which purpose barley was formerly much grown. Previously to the advent of the police, it was manufactured in large quantities, and found a ready sale on the mainland. Now, however, the natives are obliged to confine their energies to the manufacture of kelp from the drift sea-weed, which they carry by water round to Sligo, and sell to the agents of a Glasgow firm at the average rate of about £4 a ton. Fish are taken off the

island in large quantities during the summer months ; for, having no harbour, they dare not fish except in the finest weather. The rocks around the island abound in lobster, which are always to be had during the season, and of the best quality. The live stock consists of a few small and weather beaten cows and sheep, who contrive to live, with some difficulty, on the scanty herbage. There are no horses, but there are a few peculiar specimens of the donkey tribe ; how they make out life no one knows, nor do they seem to belong to anybody in particular. Perhaps, like the people themselves, they are aborigines—the sole descendants of an ancient race.

There is an island queen, heretofore greatly revered, and of parental authority ; but the spread of democratic ideas has penetrated even to this remote spot, so that her insular majesty, like many of her royal cousins, has had to endure considerable diminution of her prerogatives. She considers the presence of the police as a gross infringement of her sovereign rights ; and she would dismiss them “ bag and baggage ” as peremptorily as Mr. Gladstone would the Turks, if she only had the power. The present Prince Consort is her majesty's second husband, and in the good old times no one could distil so potent and well-favoured a “ cast ” as his royal highness. But Othello's occupation is gone ; his right hand has lost its cunning for want of practice, and the Jameson of Innismurry is renowned no more. We had the honour of being presented to the queen, who received us with dignity and graciousness, not unmixed with sadness. “ She was now old,” she said, “ and of late years her authority was set at nought by her subjects ” :—

“ Old times were changed, old manners gone,
A stranger filled the Stuart's throne.”

Not that the poor queen quoted Scott, but the lines accurately express the burden of her complaint.

They have no opportunity of hearing Mass on Sundays ; but they never fail to say the rosary, either in their own houses or, when the weather is fine, in the little chapel of St. Molaise, the patron of the island. They invariably call him “ Father

Molosh." Though dead, his spirit rules them ; he is revered and spoken of as if still living amongst them, like a parish priest, able to hear their complaints and redress their grievances.

No person has been known to die without the rites of the Church, although the island is so far from the mainland and so difficult of access in severe weather. Either the priest "overtakes them," or they come ashore before they grow dangerously ill, in order that they may, in case of need, receive the Sacraments. Almost all the children, too, are brought to the mainland to be baptised in the Church, and generally within ten or fifteen days after their birth ; nor does the voyage seem to injure in the least either the child or mother who generally accompanies it.

A national school was opened a few years ago. Most of the children can now read and write, and are well instructed in the Christian doctrine. A short time ago Irish was exclusively the language of the people, but English is now commonly spoken. The school-house at present is a cold and dreary timber-roofed shed, with only too much ventilation, and an earthen floor, where the poorly clad children put in a shivering and reluctant attendance in winter. The annual visit to this school for results examination is a source of terror to most of the Board's Inspectors.

But it is its ancient ruins which make this desolate island so interesting. These ruins are bounded by a huge circular wall, ten to twelve feet thick, and originally about fifteen feet high. This immense wall encloses an area of nearly half an acre, and was built of large, flat stones without cement or mortar of any kind, but closely and accurately fitted together. There does not appear to be any external opening except one small subterranean passage. No doubt this was intended as a precaution against external foes, especially the Danes, who, in the eighth and ninth centuries, ravaged all the coasts and harbours of Ireland, and more than once burnt all they could burn of this very monastery. The cells were constructed in this wall ; seven of them yet remain. They are very small, of bee-hive shape, with low doors on the inside. " Yet there, on the wet soil, with that dripping

roof above them, was the chosen home of these poor men. Through winter frost, through rain and storm, through summer sunshine, generation after generation of them lived and prayed, and at last lay down and died." ¹ And here, beneath our feet, they sleep in peace; you can read their names on those ancient grave-stones.

There are four churches remaining within the sacred enclosure, small in size, and of a rude and primitive construction. The principle of the arch appears to be unknown; all the doors and windows are covered with flat lintels, except in one solitary instance in which the altar window was arched—the arch having been hewn out of the stone. No cement or grouting of any kind was used in their construction. The smallest, and apparently the most ancient of these buildings, is called "Father Molaise's Chapel." It is about ten feet in height, with a stone roof and a low doorway. It is twelve feet long, and about eight feet in breadth. At the east end, facing the doorway, there is a rude altar, built of loose stones; the altar stone has been broken by some rude hand; the fragments contain part of an inscription in Latin written in Irish characters, commencing with the words: "Hic dormit Diarmid . . ." The remainder was partially defaced, so that I was unable to decipher it. Near the doorway the earth is stained with a dark, reddish colour: the islanders say it is the blood of St. Molaise which marks the spot where he lies buried. On the epistle corner of the altar there is a quaintly-carved oaken statue of the Saint, evidently of great antiquity. The same rude hands that broke the altar stone defaced this venerable relic of ancient art, and cast it into the sea. It was done by some Orangemen ² from the mainland, whose names have acquired an infamous immortality, and who justified the conduct by pretending that it was the figure-head of a ship belonging to the Spanish Armada which was wrecked in the bay. The statue, however, though thrown into the sea, with the receding wind and tide, was found on shore next morning; and the islanders

¹ Froude's *Short Studies*, vol. ii., p. 216.

² Sir John Lubbock, M.P., gives a somewhat different account of this act of vandalism in his paper "On the Preservation of our Ancient National Mounments," in *The Nineteenth Century*, No. 2, April, 1877.

stoutly assert that if "Father Molosh" was thrown out in mid ocean he would return, in spite of wind and tide, to the island which he loved so well. Here are also to be seen scattered around numerous grave stones with inscriptions in the earliest Irish characters which I was unable to decipher, and all commencing with the words, "Or do —" "Pray for."

Our guide specially called our attention to the "Cursing Stones"—some sixty round sea-stones irregularly arranged on a kind of rude platform. It is said no one could ever find exactly the same number on a second enumeration—an assertion which we vainly endeavoured to disprove. The islanders assert that if these stones are "turned against anyone," that is, with evil intent, some signal chastisement or untimely death will overtake that person within twelve months, if he deserves it; otherwise, the penalty will fall on the head of him who unjustly invoked the divine wrath. It is notorious in the neighbourhood that a certain lady, whose name was mentioned, in mockery of the superstition, turned the stones against herself, and died within the twelve months.

Another stone was pointed out within one of the unroofed chapels, on which fuel will kindle spontaneously if the fires on the island should all happen to be extinguished. They told us of a miscreant who defiled this sacred spot in wanton profanity, and immediately died a miserable death. A huge cairn of stones close by marks his dishonoured grave to which we did not scruple to add another stone in reprobation of the deed.¹

Many of the headstones are marked with crosses of great variety in design and beauty of execution. One, in particular, is an object of special veneration. Any childless matron, praying at this headstone, will receive the blessing of Anna, and become a fruitful mother. The well-trodden sod and

¹ "They loosed their curse against the king;
They cursed him in his flesh and bones;
And daily in their mystic ring
They turned the maledictive stones."

So sings Samuel Ferguson of the priests of Crom, in his *Burial of King Cormac*. In a note he speaks of it as "a pagan practice in use among the Lusitanian, as well as the Insular Celts, and of which Dr. Donovan records an instance among the latter as late as the year 1836, in the Island of Innismurry, off the coast of Sligo."

the finger-holes, worn in the stone attest the people's faith in this tradition. The island has a famous station : seven resting-places, *stationes*, for fixed prayers, four within and three without the sacred enclosure ; and it is a common practice for people to come to the island from the mainland to perform this station *ex voto*, or to obtain some special favour from God through the intercession of St. Molaise.

The monastery was founded early in the sixth century by St. Molaise and St. Columcille, and dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary. St. Molaise died here, it is said, in the year 564. Some difference of opinion arose between the two saints, and Columba left the island to the exclusive charge of St. Molaise, who appears to have been the older of the two. The "Four Masters" speak of the monastery as being governed by St. Dicholla, son of Meinida, who died in the year 747. According to the same authority, it was burned by the Danes in 807. It was finally abandoned by the religious many centuries ago. There is no trace of any modern buildings, at least of a date later than the eleventh century. There is a chapel, called by the people, "Tempol Muire"—Mary's Chapel—of about that period, but outside the walled enclosure. In 1666 the island was granted by Charles II. to Thomas Strafford and Thomas Retchliffe. It was a part of the property of the late Lord Palmerston, and now belongs to his nephew, the Rev. Mr. Sullivan. Ecclesiastically, the island belongs to the parish of Ahamlish and the diocese of Elphin.

As far as the land is concerned, the whole island is not of much value. The people are poor, the soil is barren, the climate in winter very severe. The monks of old, in their choice of a home, sought not the fertility of soil or sylvan beauty, but a secure asylum for prayer and penance. And in their eyes, though so bare and desolate, the place had a suitability and beauty of its own. They were effectually cut off from the world and its contagious influences. The waves murmured in unison with their morning and evening hymns of praise. The frequent storms, the changeful ocean, the distant mountains, reminded them of God. The wild grandeur and stern loneliness of the scenery were well suited

to foster grave and sober thoughts. And even still, a visit to this holy island cannot fail to elevate the mind and purify the heart. Its hoary ruins are eloquent memorials to the virtues of the saints who sleep within its mossy, mouldering walls. In the presence of so much that bears witness to their penance and self-denial, we feel all our own littleness and worldliness. Around us are the undesecrated graves of Ireland's holiest and earliest saints. There are the cells where they slept on the bare ground, the churches where they united in prayer, the well whose waters were their only drink.

We wandered long through this sacred enclosure, and left it reluctantly to prepare for our return journey. But the ladies lingered behind us and in that spirit of hereditary faith which kept the barons of her ancient house faithful to the Church during the stormiest centuries of England's history, the countess knelt to say a parting prayer over the graves of those forgotten Irish saints. We were soon again afloat, and, after a stormy and tedious voyage, arrived at Mullaghmore about eight o'clock, fatigued and thoroughly drenched. But we had seen where dwelt the saints of old, where they spent their lives, where their relics rest in peace ; and we felt that our day was not uselessly employed, for we ventured to hope that our pilgrimage had secured for us new intercessors in heaven.

PATRICIAN PILGRIMAGES IN IRELAND.¹

A PILGRIMAGE is a journey, undertaken from religious motives, to visit places or things that have been rendered sacred by intimate association with our Blessed Saviour or any of His Saints. We know that from the earliest Christian times it was customary to visit the Holy Places around Jerusalem of which the Holy Sepulchre was the centre ; and the virgins, Paula and Eustochium, writing A.D. 386, declare that there was a constant stream of pilgrims to Jerusalem from the very infancy of the Church—bishops, martyrs, learned men—who came to perfect their virtues by meditation and prayer in those places where the Gospel had first shone forth from the Cross. In every pilgrimage our primary object is to adore Christ, and quicken the spirit of faith and penance by personal visits to the scenes of His life, miracles and death ; or to the shrines of the saints who lived and died for Christ, that we may adore Him in His saints, and be moved by the memory of their virtues and labours to imitate their example and glorify their Master.

The pilgrimage to Rome “ *ad Limina Apostolorum* ”—that is to the graves of SS. Peter and Paul—has been made year after year since their death by crowds of pious souls from every country in Europe, and indeed we may now say in the whole world. Other famous pilgrimages for many ages have been those of St. James of Compostella and St. Thomas of Canterbury in England, and in our own time we know how the Shrine of the Blessed Virgin at Lourdes attracts thousands of devotees from all quarters of the globe. Pilgrimages have always flourished, and always will flourish, in the Church so long as the hearts of Christians are filled with the spirit of faith and love. The immediate purpose—though varying in particular cases—is usually fourfold : to quicken this faith

¹ Paper written, at the request of His Eminence Cardinal Moran, for the Australian Catholic Congress being held at Sydney this year.

and love for God ; to obtain by prayer some special grace or favour ; to atone for one's sins, and not unfrequently in fulfilment of a vow.

It is true that grave abuses have sometimes arisen in connection with pilgrimages, either on the journeys to and from, or amid the sacred scenes themselves. Avarice, intemperance, profanities of various kinds, immoralities even are not unknown, and hence the supervision of the ecclesiastical authorities is always needed to prevent the growth of such abuses. In our own time they rarely occur, but it is wise to be very vigilant lest the enemy sow his tares in the midst of the wheat.

The Irish people from the time of St. Patrick were ever fervent in faith even when weak in works, and hence, as might be expected, they were always much given to pilgrimages. We know from their lives that it was the great ambition of an Irish saint to make a pilgrimage, and as a fact many of them are said to have often done so. Some went as far as Jerusalem especially in the tenth and eleventh centuries, when the spirit of pilgrimage was keenest and most active throughout Europe. Comparatively few, however, could accomplish the foreign pilgrimage, but the manifold places of pilgrimage at home were frequented by vast crowds of the people of every grade and rank. Warm-hearted and tenacious of tradition as our fellow-countrymen are, they would not easily allow the holy places associated with the labours of saints and martyrs to be forgotten. In our travels through the country we have frequently found that some sacred spot which could not be identified by any book narrative was well known to the people of the neighbourhood, and greatly venerated by them. In that way by personal inquiry we were enabled to identify several places mentioned in the Life of St. Patrick, the exact site of which could not otherwise be ascertained. John O'Donovan with all his learning could not find out the spot where St. Patrick crossed the Shannon on his first missionary journey westward, but the peasantry around knew it well—at Drumboylan, about a mile and a half north of Battle Bridge, where the Shannon cutting through a ridge bifurcates forming an island, on both sides of which the rapid river

became easily fordable. Some of the water-worn stepping stones of the ancient ford are still there, and the place itself takes its name of Drumboylan from Buaidmoil, St. Patrick's charioteer, who died there and whose grave is still shown on the brow of the ridge over the river.

There are almost innumerable blessed wells bearing Patrick's name which mark the whole course of his missionary labours throughout the country. They are held in deep reverence by the people, and in many cases are annually resorted to as places of pilgrimage. This is not to be wondered at, for the wells were solemnly blessed by the Saint for the purpose of administering baptism to his converts. Their waters were also used in the Holy Mass which was celebrated hard by, and the Saint and his companions many a time no doubt refreshed themselves therefrom after the arduous labours of the day.

But of all the pilgrimages associated with the name of St. Patrick in Ireland there were four held in particular honour—two of which are still made every year by enormous crowds of the faithful. These are Armagh, Downpatrick, Lough Derg and Croaghpatrick—of each of which we shall now give a brief account.

ARMAGH PILGRIMAGE.

During the life-time of the Apostle, and ever since, Armagh has been held in particular esteem as the seat of St. Patrick's primacy over all the Gael. There are many circumstances which tended to preserve and intensify that spirit of holy esteem for Patrick's Royal City. It was by command of God's Angel, we are told, that Patrick took up his residence at Armagh and made it the centre of his primatial sovereignty. The same angel went before him to guide his steps when Patrick and his clergy marked out the site of his Cathedral and blessed its foundations and its area. In the little church of Na Fearta, the first that Patrick built, were enshrined the relics of Saints Peter and Paul, and of St. Stephen and St. Laurence, which Patrick himself had brought from Rome, and which on their respective festival days were honoured by all the people in solemn procession. Long after, in evil days, in the year A.D. 1033, when calamities thickened around

Armagh, the shrine containing these sacred relics was seen to drop blood on the altar of Patrick in the sight of these present in the church—*coram omnibus videntibus*—as the Ulster Annals tell. In his old age, when nearing his end, from the brow of the opposite hill, where his new Cathedral now stands, Patrick raised his arms to heaven and “from out his two hands,” we are told, he blessed his own Armagh with a fruitful and abiding blessing, and thereafter in sleep the angel appeared to him and told him that God would considerably widen the bounds of his City and See of Armagh, and put all the tribes of Erin under his spiritual sway—give them to him *in modum parochiae*. There, too, were the most sacred emblems of his authority—his Crozier, the Staff of Jesus, his Bell, and his Book.

Moreover, as the years went by, the ancient seats of Erin's temporal sovereignty were overthrown. Tara, Emania, Cruachan, Ailech and Cashel had all become waste and silent, and passed to the hands of the stranger, so the people clung with deeper affection to that spiritual city which was for them the source of authority and the home of their hearts. No wonder, indeed, that Armagh with its churches and holy wells and hallowed shrines, so intimately associated with Patrick, and so tenderly blessed by him and by God's Angel, should become a much frequented place of pilgrimage for all the children of the Gael. We are told, for instance, that in A.D. 1037 Cathal, son of Rory, King of West-Connaught, went all the way from the far West on a pilgrimage to Armagh. And many of the pilgrims considered themselves happy to die in Patrick's City, and find their graves in its sacred clay. The case of Brian Boru is well known. During one of his northern campaigns he visited Armagh, and presented at the altar of Patrick a collar of gold weighing twenty ounces. Furthermore, his secretary wrote, in his name, in the Book of Armagh a formal recognition of the primacy of Armagh over all Ireland, signed by “Brian, Emperor of the Scots”—that is of the Irish nation. And on the fatal but glorious field of Clontarf Brian's last instructions were—“my body and my soul to God and to St. Patrick; let me be carried to Armacha, and twelve score cows be given to the Comarb of

Patrick and the church of Armagh," and we know that the hero's body was borne thereto, and interred in the great church of St. Patrick.

In after ages Armagh fell into the hands of the English, and it became the residence of the Protestant primate, and no Catholic was allowed to live in the city, and no one dared visit it on pilgrimage. But we have seen in our own times a very marvellous change. The noble church with the twin towers now dominates the whole city. The Heir of Patrick clothed in the purple of Rome sits upon its throne, and the pious pilgrim may still come as of old to venerate the memorials of our national Apostle in the ancient home of his love.

DOWNPATRICK PILGRIMAGE.

Downpatrick was also a celebrated place of pilgrimage because St. Patrick was buried there, and in later times his relics with those of St. Brigid and St. Columcille were enclosed in the same grave. Some writers have denied that Patrick was buried in Down, and assert that Armagh was really the place of his sepulture, but their reasons on close examination are found to be baseless, and the authorities of antiquity, including the Book of Armagh, are clearly and emphatically against their theory.

At first the exact spot of burial was kept concealed, lest the men of Orior might come in force and by violence or stealth carry off his blessed body to their own church of Armagh. But in A.D. 552, as we learn from the *Annals of Ulster*, the tomb was revealed by an Angel to Columcille who found therein three of the *minna* or relics of Patrick, namely his Cup or Chalice, his Bell, called the "Bell of the Will," and the Book of Gospels. The Chalice he gave to Downpatrick, the Bell to Armagh and, the Book of Gospels Columcille, by direction of the Angel, reserved for himself. The other relics Columcille placed in a beautiful shrine, which thereupon was recognised as the most precious treasure of the church of Down. About the close of the seventh century there was a translation—as we learn from Tirechan or his copyist in the Book of Armagh—of at least some of the relics of Columcille

himself from Iona to Down which were immediately placed in the grave of Patrick. And at the beginning of the ninth century the shrine containing the relics of St. Brigid were brought to Down and also enclosed in the same monument, which thus became the most remarkable sepulchre in all Ireland, and naturally attracted pilgrims from even the remotest portions of the country.

During the devastations of the Danes it was considered desirable to hide away those much prized shrines. The pilgrimages were therefore interrupted, and the hiding-place seems thus in course of time to have been forgotten. But in A.D. 1186 the spot where they lay was revealed to Malachy, Bishop of Down, and, in presence of Cardinal Vivian and a vast host of prelates and clergy, the bones and other relics were taken up, enclosed in new separate coffins, and then solemnly re-interred. John de Courcy was at the time Master of Downpatrick, and the native Irish put small trust in this Invention of the relics of the saints, which was designed, they said, to give some heavenly sanction to this rude warrior's conquest. Yet the Bishop Malachy was a Celt, and it is hard to suppose that he would lend himself to the perpetration of a spiritual fraud, and John de Courcy, whatever else he was, was certainly not a schemer.

When the Protestants got possession of Down and all its sacred treasures, no pilgrims dared show their faces there for many generations. But now they are allowed to visit the cathedral precincts, and many come and try to find out for themselves the triple grave of Patrick, Brigid and Columcille. The supposed spot is outside the latter church, and here, day after day the sacred soil is lovingly scooped up by the hands of poor emigrants about to start for America to be kept by them as a priceless souvenir until their dying hour. Small sympathy or welcome, however, do they get in Downpatrick now, for the last resting-place of our National Apostle has unhappily become one of the strongholds of Orangemen in the North.

LOUGH DERG PILGRIMAGE.

The pilgrimage to St. Patrick's Purgatory, Lough Derg, County Donegal, is of late years coming back to something of

its olden prominence and popularity. The Station Island as it is called, lies in the middle of the lake, which from the point of embarkation is about four miles due north of the little town of Pettigo. It is simply a mass of barren rock, rising a few feet above the surface of the water, 126 yards long, varying in breadth from 22 to 45 yards, and not quite three quarters of an acre in extent. Yet upon this narrow area there are, besides a grand cross and campanile, two neat churches, St. Mary's and St. Patrick's, the latter being the "Prison chapel" which takes the place of the old Purgatory—a dwelling-house for three or four priests, and a hospice and several well-kept cottages for the accommodation of the pilgrims.

The history of the Purgatory is full of striking vicissitude, which, however, we can barely touch on here. It was in former times situated on a much larger island called "Saints' Island," lying two miles to the north-west of Station Island, and consisted in the main of a dark cave in which St. Patrick is said to have had a vision of our Blessed Saviour.

In a metrical work, *De Purgatorio S. Patritii*, written about the year A.D. 1152, by Henry, a Benedictine Monk of Saltrey in Huntingdonshire, we have the first recorded account of the Purgatory. Henry had received his information from Gilbert another monk from Lincoln. He in turn had learned all the details from Owen, an Irish soldier in the army of King Stephen, who in atonement for his sins had actually made a pilgrimage to the "Lake of Penance." Owen, in the words of Henry of Saltrey, tells how "Our Lord Jesus Christ visibly appeared to St. Patrick, and led him into a desert place, and there showed him a circular cave (*fossam rotundam*), dark inside, and at the same time said to him, whoever, armed with the true faith and truly penitent, will enter that cave and remain in it for the space of a day and a night will be purged from the sins of his whole life—that is obtain a plenary indulgence—and, moreover, passing through it, if his faith fail not—(*si in fide constanter egisset*)—he will witness not only the torments of the damned but also the joys of the blessed. . . . And since the pilgrim is there purged of his sins the place is named the Purgatory of St. Patrick." The

genuineness of the vision is indeed open to doubt, but we think it almost certain that our Apostle once at least visited Lough Derg, and spent some time in contemplation and prayer on its lonely islands, and perhaps even in this very "*fossa rotunda*" on Saints' Island. That he visited the Lake is at all events the unbroken tradition of the people which no reliable historian would lightly set aside.

Henry of Saltrey's story soon spread to the continent, and it became still more widely known from its having been freely utilised by Dante and Calderon in their immortal works. So we are not surprised to read in records of the reigns of Edward III. and Richard II., for example, of safe conducts having been given to troops of men and horses who accompanied knights from Hungary and Italy and even the Island of Rhodes on their way to pilgrimages on this desert island in Lough Derg. In like manner, in Froissart and the Four Masters, we are told of French and Spanish noblemen who successfully accomplished the dangerous enterprise.

And thus pilgrims were coming from far and near till towards the close of the fifteenth century Pope Alexander VI. acting, it is said, at the instigation of a Dutch monk from Eymstede, officially ordered the suppression of the pilgrimage "*quia fuit occasio turpis avaritice.*"

According to the *Annals of Ulster* the reason for the suppression was that the Purgatory which was the object of veneration was not the same which the Lord had shown to Patrick. Be that as it may, the period of suppression did not last long. Other counsels prevailed in Rome, and not only was the pilgrimage allowed to be revived, but it was even endowed with liberal indulgences by the Holy See.

Probably at this time took place the transfer of the station from Saints' Island to Station Island, and soon afterwards of the guardianship from the Canons of St. Augustine to the Franciscans. For many years past the pilgrimage has been in charge of certain secular clergy of the Diocese of Clogher nominated by the Bishop, the senior of whom is called the "Prior," and it has grown under them in magnitude and popular favour. To a considerable extent this is due to the light that has been shed upon its chequered history by the

Very Rev. Canon O'Connor in his fascinating and exhaustive work "St. Patrick's Purgatory," and also to the generous patronage of successive popes during the last half century.

So far back as 1714 when Ireland was groaning under the Penal Laws, Primate Hugh McMahon writes of the pilgrimage—"whilst everywhere else throughout the Kingdom the ecclesiastical functions have ceased by reason of the prevailing persecution, in this island, as if it were placed in another orb, the exercise of religion is free and public, which is to be ascribed to a special favour of Divine Providence and to the merits of St. Patrick."

Yes, truly—and it should never be forgotten—this and the other Patrician pilgrimages may be largely thanked that the spirit of faith was kept alive in the people's hearts during the long years of dark and bitter persecution in Ireland.

CROAGHPATRICK PILGRIMAGE.

But the real National pilgrimage of Ireland is undoubtedly that to Cruachan Aigli—now called Croaghpatrick—the beautiful cone-shaped mountain which rises in solitary grandeur to a height of 2,510 feet over the southern shores of Clew Bay. On the summit of this lofty mountain Patrick spent the whole Lent of the year A.D. 441, or indeed longer, for he ascended on Shrove Saturday, that is the Saturday before Ash Wednesday, and remained there till the eve of Easter Sunday. To this fact, one of the best authenticated in the Life of our Apostle, we owe the origin of the pilgrimage which year after year is made to the wind-swept summit of this mountain. The *Annals of Ulster*, under date A.D. 441, have this entry: "Leo ordained forty-second Bishop of the Church of Rome, and Patrick the Bishop was approved in the Catholic Faith." And the Tripartite Life says: "when Patrick was on Cruachan Aigli he sent Munis (his nephew) to Rome with counsel for the Abbot of Rome (that is the Pope) and relics were given to him"—to bring home to Patrick. These are highly important statements, and taken together give a singularly historic interest to this holy mountain.

We learn from the ancient writers that Patrick dwelt

upon the mountain in great discomfort of body and mind, that he prayed and fasted incessantly, and that when he was exhausted by his long suffering and his fierce conflicts with the powers of darkness, the Angel Victor appeared to him, and suggested that he should go down and celebrate the Easter with his friends in the beautiful valley of Aghagower at the foot. How could the "Reek"—as Croaghpatrick is familiarly called—fail to become a popular place of pilgrimage with the men and women of Ireland for whose salvation the Saint fasted and prayed and sorely mortified himself there during more than forty days and forty nights ?

And so we find it was from the very beginning. The old road on the Aghagower side may still be distinctly traced, for it was trodden through long ages by hundreds of thousands who believed in the promise of pardon said to have been made to Patrick in favour of those who in a true spirit of penance made the pilgrimage to the top. Jocelyn tells us in the twelfth century that crowds of people used in his time to ascend the Reek, and give themselves to fasting and contemplation and prayer. Again in the *Annals of Loch Cé* we read that King Hugh O'Connor cut off the hands and feet of a highwayman who attempted to molest one of the pilgrims thereto. We could multiply indefinitely references from the ancient writers to prove the continuance of the pilgrimage to the Reek down through the centuries even from the time of St. Patrick himself.

In view, however, of the great difficulty of making the ascent, especially in inclement weather, the late Archbishop of Tuam, Most Rev. Dr. McEvilly, begged authority from Rome to change the place of pilgrimage to the Church at Lecanvey which lies to the north-west at a short distance from the base. On the 27th May, 1883, his Grace's request was formally acceded to, and a plenary indulgence was granted to all who on any day during the months, June, July or August, should visit that church, fulfilling of course certain other necessary conditions ; and a partial indulgence of a hundred days for every single visit made thereto during the same three months.

It has always, however, been found difficult to transfer

with any success a place of pilgrimage from the original site, and so we ourselves deemed it expedient to designate again the little oratory on the top called "Templepatrick." This very primitive and unsuitable structure, was replaced in the year 1905, mainly through the exertions of the present zealous administrator of Westport, by a solid concrete building, which will, we hope, for centuries to come admirably serve its holy purpose.

The regular day of pilgrimage is Garland Sunday, that is the last Sunday of July. In the year 1904 we ourselves, accompanied by the Most Rev. Dr. Lyster, Bishop of Achonry, successfully clambered to the top. Again in the following year we ascended, and canonically blessed the little chapel to which reference has just been made. The illustrious Cardinal Primate of Australia, when Bishop of Ossory, also, we have heard, made the rugged climb, and his Eminence will testify that it is an arduous task, and if performed in the spirit of faith and penance, cannot fail to have considerable efficacy towards one's soul's salvation. We are aware, too, that it is his Eminence's fond wish—for everything connected with St. Patrick is dear to him—that this pilgrimage to the Reek should year after year rapidly grow and prosper, as indeed with the blessing of God it has rapidly grown and prospered for the last six or seven years.

Pilgrimage day this year fell upon the 25th July, just a few days before these words were penned. The leading Catholic journal of Ireland on the following day devoted graphic columns of its space to telling of "the Masses that began on the summit in the mists of the early morning—celebrated by priests of different races and countries—the ceaseless, laborious climbing of the thousands of pilgrims up the winding way of the mountain till the last arduous stretch which tries the strongest, the penitential fervour and the ardent prayers of young and old—from the child of five to the octogenarian—the Rosary and other spiritual exercises in Latin and in Irish and in English, the whole living scene of the faith and piety of the greatest pilgrimage of one of the most Catholic of European lands." And it continues, "those who have once taken part in the ascent, and heard Mass at the little shrine on

the day of the revived pilgrimage, do not speak of it without a deep emotion as one of the great experiences of a lifetime, the sense of the antiquity and living power of the old religion of the race, the sense of privilege in being where Naomh Padraig was, and praying where he prayed for Ireland. It is well for the country that has such memories and such holy places of its own." And in a similar strain wrote many of the other journals of the British Isles, Protestant as well as Catholic.

A non-Catholic professor of history in Cambridge University—a very learned man—has recently said of Croaghpatrick—"The confined space of its summit is the one spot where we feel some assurance that we can stand literally in Patrick's footsteps, and realise that, as we look southward over the desolate moors and tarns of Murrisk, northward across the bay to the hills of Burrishoole and Erris, and then westward beyond the islets to the spaces of the ocean, we are viewing a scene on which Patrick for many days looked forth with the bodily eye."

And we ourselves lecturing under the shadow of this lordly hill, have told the people who have the happiness of dwelling amid the most sacred scenes of our Apostle's life, how "we have come to love the Reek with a kind of personal love, not merely on account of its graceful symmetry and soaring pride, but also because it is Patrick's holy mountain—the scene of his penance and of his passionate yearning prayers for our fathers and for us. It is to us, moreover, the symbol of Ireland's enduring faith; and fronting the stormy west, unchanged and unchangeable, it is also the symbol of the constancy and success with which the Irish people faced the storms of persecution during many woeful centuries. It is the proudest and most beautiful of the everlasting hills that are the crown and glory of this western land of ours. When the skies are clear and the soaring cone can be seen in its own solitary grandeur, no eye will turn to gaze upon it without delight. Even when the rain clouds shroud its brow we know that it is still there, and that when the storms have swept over it it will reveal itself once more in all its calm beauty and majestic strength. It is, therefore, the fitting

type of Ireland's faith, and of Ireland's nationhood, which nothing has ever shaken, and with God's blessing nothing can ever destroy."

His Eminence Cardinal Moran will no doubt join with us in imploring that the divine blessing may rest on the patrician pilgrimages of Ireland, and that the prayer of Patrick, which he prayed so incessantly for the men of this beloved western land whom "God had given him at the ends of the world," may be a fruitful and efficacious prayer for ever.

THE METAPHYSICS OF THE SCHOOL.¹

WE have just received ² the Second Volume of Father Harper's "Metaphysics of the School," which enables us to form a fair opinion, not only on what we have seen, but also on the two volumes that will complete the work.¹ We may fairly assume that the two remaining volumes will receive the same exhaustive and masterly treatment as those already published, and in that case the work will certainly enrich the philosophy and language of England. The task which Father Harper has undertaken is an arduous one. It requires learning, labour, courage, and perseverance; and, from what we have seen, we think it may be safely asserted that our author is not wanting in any of these essential requisites. No man who knows anything of scholastic philosophy will deny that it is a large subject, and requires a large mind to grasp it in its entirety. Anyone may get a smattering thereof, but few minds are capacious enough to grasp the mighty whole, and, at the same time, master its minutest details in all their bewildering complexity. Now this is exactly what Father Harper has done. We do not pronounce this opinion after a hasty and superficial examination; we have carefully and conscientiously read the greater part of the two volumes before us, and our subsequent animadversions will be a sufficient guarantee that we express the language of honest conviction.

In the Introduction, our author first disposes of three charges brought against the Schoolmen:—(1) That they adopted a barbarous terminology; (2) that they offended against classic purity of style; (3) that their diction is dry and poor.

The first is the main charge; it really includes the other

¹ *The Metaphysics of the School.* By the Rev. Thomas Harper, S.J. Macmillan & Co.

² This review of Father Harper's work appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, July, 1881.

two. No one who has any notion of what is meant by propriety of style will censure the dryness of Suarez on metaphysics, any more than one would censure the dryness of Euclid in mathematics. Father Harper's answer to the first charge is complete and crushing. It is an *argumentum ad hominem* which leaves no possibility of evasion or reply. He simply takes up the modern scientific books on physiology, chemistry, and botany, cites a few passages of elegant extracts, which no man but an expert in these sciences can understand, or even pronounce; and then asks—no matter what meaning you assign to *barbarous*—is there anything in Suarez, St. Thomas, or any other Scholastic, half so *barbarous* as this modern scientific jargon? He does not undertake to say that this extravagantly learned terminology may not be useful, and even necessary; but, if you adopt it in its most extreme forms in the physical sciences, how can you, he says, reprobate it in metaphysics? Then he goes farther, and shows that the scholastic terminology was really invented by Aristotle, who knew Greek certainly as well as our modern lights; that the Scholastics literally translated his language into Latin, which they had a perfect right to do; and that after all there is not in the science of metaphysics one difficult or unusual word for every ten that may be found in any manual, at least in any learned manual, of the modern scientists.

In the Second Part of his Introduction, the author says that he does not pretend to *originality* of doctrine, he merely undertakes to formulate and expound in the English language the Metaphysics of the School. No doubt, he adds, the great Scholastic Doctors differed much among themselves on minor points, but they were in the main agreed; and it is the substantive doctrine, in which they for the most part agreed, that he expounds for us, not the minor points in which they differ. On the whole he follows the *order* of Suarez and the *doctrine* of St. Thomas, which, he justly adds, is, in metaphysics, almost identical with the doctrine of Aristotle. When these three are agreed, it may be taken for granted that there is always good reason for their unanimity existing in the nature of things. It is altogether unlikely that the modern lights of the scientific firmament will shine so brightly

and so steadily through the mists of future ages. We think these minor lights are very large and bright, because we are so near them, but, in the region of metaphysics, most of them are mere will-o'-the-wisps, that flicker over the quagmires of a licentious infidelity.

It is noteworthy, too, that Father Harper had evidently adopted the Thomist Philosophy in its entirety, even before the appearance of the Encyclical of Leo XIII., which recommends so strongly the philosophy of the Angelic Doctor. This work, therefore, has not been written to order, but it is all the more opportune.

We have said that Father Harper had courage in undertaking this task. This he showed, not only on account of the magnitude of the work, but also because he wrote it in English, and undertook to vindicate what very many, even amongst Catholics, regarded as an exploded philosophy.

The English tongue has had no metaphysical terminology. It has no writer on metaphysics properly so called. We have had short and very imperfect treatises on logic, ideology, and psychology, but no work on the science of being. Our author, therefore, had to form to a great extent his own scientific terminology, and he has done it with almost complete success. The English tongue is flexible, and has a great adaptability for new compounds. New compounds, however, were seldom wanted, and have been rarely employed. What the author had to do was to translate the scholastic terms according to the analogy of the English language, and, as we have said, he does this courageously and successfully. When he appears to us to fail, as he does in one or two instances it is because he has not adhered to his own principles. For instance, he translates *materia prima* as *primordial* matter. He had the choice of the adjectives *prime*, *primal*, and *primary*, any of which appears to us to be a better word than *primordial*, for the latter is a compound term, while *prima* is not, and, moreover, suggests the pre-existence of the matter in a chaotic state, rather than its concreation and present coexistence with the substantial forms which he himself advocates.

He renders the term *sensibilis*, used by the Scholastics,

as *sensile* not *sensible*. We hardly think there is sufficient warranty for this innovation. No doubt, the word *sensible* is ambiguous, but so is *sensibilis*, and αἰσθητός, the term used by Aristotle. He might, however, determine its subjective and objective meaning, and it would then be quite as definite as the other, and much more appropriate. As far as we know, *sensilis* has been used only by Lucretius because it suited his metre; *sensibilis* is, indeed, rare in classical authors, but it has been used in its philosophical meaning both by Seneca and Vitrius, as well as by all the Scholastics, who, as a rule, never allow themselves to vary from the terminology of Aristotle. We think it a sound principle, and for that very reason object to *sensile* for *sensible*. For the same reason, we object to *principium* being rendered *principiant* in English. It is not in accordance with the analogy of our language, and the English word *principle* is not more vague or unphilosophical than *principium* or ἀρχή. It is quite as easy to determine the philosophical meaning of this word in English as in Latin or Greek. We think the rendering of *principiatum* by *principiate* is much less open to objection.

We now come to examine Father Harper's doctrine—not his, indeed, he says, but the doctrine of St. Thomas. St. Thomas, however, is not infallible especially where he differs from Suarez, and where his own great School are divided as to his real meaning. Hence *in dubiis libertas*.

The fundamental doctrine of St. Thomas and of Aristotle, which runs through all the metaphysics of the School, is the doctrine of the Primal Matter and Substantial Forms. Father Harper devotes the greater part of his Second Volume to the exposition and defence of this philosophy of matter and form. Nowhere else will the reader find the question discussed so fully, so ably, and so successfully. Father Harper has had in this respect a great advantage over those who have gone before him. He has spent many years in the study of the scholastic metaphysics, but he is also an excellent physicist, and applies his knowledge of modern science to the defence and illustration of the metaphysics of the Stagirite, in a way that neither Aristotle nor St. Thomas

could ever dream of. He fights the enemies of the scholastic metaphysics on their own ground, and with their own weapons. He shows that the old philosophy furnishes a more satisfactory solution of the facts of modern science than the atomic, or dynamic, or any other of the current theories of modern philosophy. He agrees with the scientists while they confine themselves to the proven facts of their science ; but when they begin to theorize, he bids them good-bye, and requests them to agree amongst themselves, before they invite him to join the happy family.

It is his familiarity with modern physics that makes Father Harper's exposition of the doctrine of Primal Matter and Substantial Forms so exceedingly valuable ; and for this reason we earnestly hope that men of mind and leisure—both are needed—will endeavour to examine this system for themselves. To read this treatise will require time and patience, but the laborious student will be amply repaid. Metaphysics is the Queen of Sciences ; no other discipline so enlarges the mind and strengthens its highest faculties. It has of course been derided and ignored by non-Catholics ; but it has always held, and must always hold, a prominent place in the schools of Catholic theology. Investigation into the science of Being is surely a more useful and ennobling training for the mind than disquisitions on the Greek particles, or a scientific analysis of insects and worms.

There are, moreover, two very special reasons why the philosophy of St. Thomas, which is put before us by Father Harper, should receive our special attention. Our present Holy Father has given his high sanction to that doctrine and urges the Episcopacy of the Catholic Church to have it taught in all their colleges and seminaries. We cannot be deaf to the voice of Peter ; we must examine, and, as far as possible, accept, and teach this philosophy. It is not of faith indeed ; in many points we are free to reject, to modify, or to improve it : but in the main it will be taught henceforward in all our great Catholic schools, long after the ephemeral systems of our own day shall have sunk into oblivion.

Now, beyond all question, the doctrine of Matter and

Substantial Forms is fundamental to the philosophy of St. Thomas ; we do not say in all its details, but certainly in its main principles. Yet even these main principles are not as thoroughly understood in our schools as perhaps they ought to be. An accurate knowledge of the philosophical meaning of the terms themselves is absolutely necessary for the successful study of theology in all its great branches—dogmatic, moral, and sacramental. The merest tyro knows how often the terms *material* and *formal*, *matter* and *form*, *materialiter* and *formaliter*, recur in every branch of the sacred sciences. It is true, indeed, that these words are not always used in the same sense ; and rarely in their purely philosophic sense ; but in all cases the theological meaning will be found to be analogous to the philosophical meaning, and the former, therefore, can never be *clearly* understood by one who is entirely ignorant of the latter. For instance, we speak of the *matter* and *form* of the Sacraments, we must know what they are in each Sacrament, yet how can we understand the analogous meaning if we do not understand their primary meaning ? Matter and Form have exactly the same relation to each other in the formation of the supernatural entity called a Sacrament, as Matter and Form, in material things, have in the formation of physical entities ; we cannot rightly understand one without the other.

There is one point of great interest discussed by Father Harper—what is the principle of individuation ? It was the most difficult and the most burning question in the Schools, and we think it will survive even Father Harper's discussion.

He undertakes to defend the doctrine of St. Thomas, which is, on this question, no easy task, and he places the principle of individuation in the *materia signata* ; and endeavours to reconcile Suarez on this point with St. Thomas, in which, he will pardon us for saying, we do not think he has succeeded. This is not the place for a discussion of this most abstruse and interesting question. But it is strange that if the *materia signata* be the principle of individuation the Thomists themselves cannot agree in explaining what is meant by the term. Neither does St. Thomas seem

quite in accord with himself in his own explanations. In one place he says it is the matter as affected by *determinate* dimensions.¹ In another place he says,² "these determined dimensions are founded in the subject already completed," and therefore do not constitute, but presuppose the individual to be already constituted. Father Harper attempts to reconcile these statements, but only with very imperfect success. Either this *materia*, which is supposed to individuate the previously communicable form, is affected by determinate dimensions or by indeterminate dimensions. Not, however, by the former, for the reason given by St. Thomas himself, because determination of figure and dimension presupposes the subject as already constituted in its individuality, and this is admitted by Father Harper. Neither can it be matter affected by indeterminate dimensions, for indeterminate dimension is an *ens rationis*, has no objective existence, therefore it cannot *really* affect matter, therefore it would be indeterminate, not determinate matter, that would become the differentiating principle of the individual, and therefore not *materia qua signata*. And St. Thomas himself, in the commentary on Boetius, admits that indeterminate dimensions have no objective existence. Therefore, says Father Harper, he speaks only of the differentiating principle from a *metaphysical* point of view; but Suarez speaks of it from a *physical* point of view, and thus *seems* to differ from the teaching of St. Thomas. If the metaphysical point of view, that is our way of conceiving the manner of individuation, is not conformable to the actual manner of individuation, so much the worse for the scientific value of our knowledge. It is unreal and false, not having any objective reality to correspond with it, as the individual man corresponds to our metaphysical conception thereof in other respects. We doubt very much whether St. Thomas would

¹ "Materia dimensionibus subjecta est principium distinctionis numeralia;" and again, "materia in singulari est . . . individuationis principium quae est materia signata sub determinatis dimensionibus existens; ex hac enim forma individuat." *De Ver.* Quest. x. a. 5.

² "Ipsae dimensionis terminate quae fundantur in subjecto jam completo individuantur quodammodo ex materia individuata per dimensiones *interminatas praeintellectas* in materia." Opusculum LX. in Librum Boetii *De Trin.*

be prepared to accept this vindication of his own doctrines at the expense of his consistency. For he was consistent at least, and, since he placed the principle of individuation in matter, he was forced to admit that angels being pure spirits or forms, cannot be differentiated naturally within the same species, hence he thought that although by *potentia absoluta* God could create several angels within the same species, as a matter of fact, He did not do so, and by *potentia ordinaria* could not do so—a conclusion which greatly scandalized the Scholastics of the time, and is certainly not a common opinion amongst theologians. There could therefore be no second Lucifer to take the place of the fallen angel, there might be a greater or a less, but no distinct angel of exactly the same specific nature. The consequence is inevitable but somewhat inconvenient, as Duns Scotus showed to demonstration long ago. It has been abandoned by the ablest theologians even of the Thomist School, and was condemned by the Doctors of the Sorbonne in 1278, not that we think the worse of the opinion on that account, but it shows how unanimously it was rejected by the contemporaries of St. Thomas himself.

In two appendices our author develops the doctrine of St. Thomas on two most important points, the genesis of the natural world, that is the evolution of material bodies from created matter ; and secondly the genesis of the human being, which is completed by the union of soul and body. This is not the place to examine our author's doctrine on these two points ; we can only indicate the nature of the opinions put forward, which, however, deserve the gravest consideration on account of the solution which they furnish to certain problems of urgent importance.

St. Thomas, then, teaches that the original creative act terminated in spiritual intelligences, the celestial bodies, and the simple elements. Leaving spiritual intelligences out of the question, and taking the word " elements " in the sense of St. Thomas, it is only another way of saying that at first God created mind and matter, (St. Thomas erroneously believed celestial matter to be of a different nature from terrestrial matter.)

But this matter was not yet disposed for the evolution therefrom of the various beings in this world of life and beauty. In order thereto he impressed or implanted in matter certain natural forces, *rationes seminales*, as he calls them, that is the active and passive powers of nature which are the proximate sources of all animal and vegetable life, of all the beauty and variety in the universe. These seminal virtues were implanted in matter not by the original creative act, but by the work of the six days, as narrated in the Book of Genesis.

By the work of the six days, however, we need not, indeed, according to St. Augustine ought not, understand six periods of time of any length, great or small; but, rather according to the very probable opinion of St. Augustine, the term is to be understood as indicating the *order of sequence* which was adopted by divine Omnipotence, in implanting the seminal influences in the lifeless, motionless, and formless elemental matter. *The earth was at first without form and void.* Thus the divine virtue of the creative act manifesting itself in matter by the successive virtues which it imparts thereto, is exhibited to us, in a popular way, as doing these wondrous works in so many successive days, whereas in reality they were as yet only done *in virtute*, not *formaliter*. The work of the third day did not *actually* clothe the earth with grass and flowers and fruits, but gave it the virtue of producing these in after times, when the necessary antecedent evolution was accomplished. The water did not produce the creeping things, nor the birds of heaven expand their wings in actual flight on the fifth day; but the vegetable universe, then existing in potentiality, received a new fecundity, in virtue of which it would in future ages produce the creeping things of earth, and the soaring birds of heaven. And so on with the rest; all the seminal influences were thus successively implanted in matter, until at last, to crown the work, the body of man was formed in the same way, and then God, by His own immediate act, breathed in him the breath of life, and man became a living soul. The formative power of evolving the human organism was the last

virtue implanted by God in matter ; and thus in the fulness of time the soul would be united to the body by the immediate act of God himself. This evolution of man's body, like the bodies of other animals, is not so explicitly put forward by Father Harper, but we take it for granted as the natural consequence of this interpretation of the work of the six days.¹ St. Thomas himself seems to favour the opinion that the six days indicate succession of *time* ; but he refers without disapprobation to the opinion of St. Augustine, who explains them of a mere succession of order.

It will now be understood, whether we adopt the opinion of St. Thomas or St. Augustine, how it was that during the six days God *created*, and afterwards for all time *administers* the work of His hands. His divine concursus is always necessary, but abstracting from this perennial exercise of divine power, Nature, after creation, slowly but surely works out the divine Will, under the direction of divine Providence, by its own innate virtue. The created primary forces—gravity, cohesion, chemical affinity, etc.,—work of the will of God, at first in inorganic matter, forming crystals, and rocks, and minerals, producing heat and light, and giving being to sun and stars through all the realms of space. Then the seminal influences of vegetable life come into action, and clothe the earth with the rich and various products of the vegetable kingdom, which in their turn furnish the means of evolution for all the forms of animal life on earth, or sky, or sea.

As in the postscript of a lady's letter, Father Harper puts his most interesting points in the appendices, and so we find him discussing, briefly however, the very important question to which he also refers in the body of the work—namely the time and manner in which the human soul begins to inform the human body.

This question Father Harper discusses in connection with the doctrine of St. Thomas on matter and form, and it is not only interesting in itself, but, if it ever would be solved in this

¹ However, at page 743, Appendix A., vol. ii., Father Harper observes : " God is said to have *formed* the human body, because He is the sole efficient cause of its organization that is, of the *potentiality* by which matter was disposed for this evolution."

sense to a certainty, it would lead to most important theological conclusions in practice.

He admits that it is now the common opinion of theologians and Christian physiologists, that the human embryo is animated from the first moment of conception, and not only animated but informed with a rational and immortal soul. Hence the great importance of endeavouring, by all means in our power, to secure Baptism for every living *fetus* expelled from the womb, from any cause, at any stage of its existence. Still numberless immature human beings will inevitably perish without Baptism, for it has been calculated, that the number of premature births and abortions amounts to one-eighth of the entire number that comes to maturity. And it is by no means easy, with these facts before our eyes, to explain how it can be truly said that God wishes the salvation of all, seeing that, in so many cases, it is physically impossible to procure the spiritual regeneration of all these immature human beings.

Doubtless, for these amongst other reasons, Father Harper prefers to adopt the opinion of St. Thomas, regarding the time and manner in which the human soul is informed by the human body. He admits that the body is a *living* body from the beginning, but denies that it is informed by a human soul. According to Father Harper St. Thomas teaches "that in the human embryo there is a succession of generations and corruptions (in the philosophical sense of these words), by means of which the future child passes through a vegetative and sensitive life, previous to its receiving the human soul." There is a succession of Forms in the embryo, each successive form being of a higher nature than its immediate antecedent, until the organism becomes sufficiently perfected to receive the human soul, which displaces the ultimate animal form, and supplies its place for all the purposes of vegetable, animal, and rational life. The preceding forms, he adds, are purely provisional, and are the result of a purely natural generation or development, proceeding from one and the same efficient cause. Of course the human soul being a purely spiritual substance, is itself the immediate work of God.

We confess a strong leaning towards this doctrine, not only on account of the authority of St. Thomas, but of its own intrinsic probability, and the easier solution which it affords to the theological difficulties already indicated. It cannot now be questioned that the embryo lives from the moment of conception, and lives not only by a vegetable life of growth, but by an animal life, capable of spontaneous movement. Nay more, very many physiologists think that the *spermatozoa* are, as their name indicates, living animalcules, even before conception; and that by the impregnation of the ovum, the animalcule is merely placed *in situ* for the purposes of nutrition and development. But to hold that the rudimentary embryo is living is quite a different thing from holding that it is informed with a human soul. Why admit the existence of the spiritual essence as necessary for the information of this speck of protoplasm, in which, for weeks after conception, the microscope can hardly detect the first faint traces of a human organism? We think it highly improbable in itself, and apart from the authority of the theologians who defend this opinion, would much prefer to fall back on the old scholastic doctrine, that the *fetus* is not animated for a considerable period after conception, meaning thereby not animated by a human soul. When the mysterious work of generation is completed, by the introduction of the immortal form, can never be known for certain, and hence priests must always be careful to use their best efforts to secure the Baptism of every living *fetus*, no matter how immature, at least when it shows traces even of a rudimentary human body.

It is sufficiently evident from our brief references, what momentous questions, both for philosophers and theologians, are discussed by Father Harper in these volumes. We hope we have sufficiently stimulated the curiosity of our readers, to induce them to read the volumes for themselves, and if they do so, they will certainly find ample matter for fruitful speculation.

OUR IRISH ROMANESQUE ARCHITECTURE.¹

I PROPOSE merely to make some general remarks on Irish Romanesque Architecture, with special reference to the County Galway and the Cistercian Romanesque, as shown in some of our existing monuments.

It is hardly necessary to remind you that, in the Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland, we find three periods fundamentally distinct, the periods namely of the Primitive Christian Architecture, the Romanesque style, and the Pointed. The Primitive period extended from the time of St. Patrick down to the year 900, or thereabouts, that is the time of the first lull in the Danish wars. The Romanesque succeeded, and continued down to the Anglo-Norman Invasion of Ireland, that is, for nearly 300 years. This was followed by a brief period of transition, extending from 1170 to 1225, that is little more than 50 years, but it was rich in great architectural achievements of the highest art. The third period extended from 1225, and continued for some 300 years, down to the religious revolution of the sixteenth century. This third period has produced many very beautiful edifices, of which we have excellent specimens in the County Galway, like Ross Abbey and Kilconnell and Loughrea—all in the Pointed style.

It is difficult to fix the exact period at which the Romanesque was introduced, or whence it was immediately derived; and, of course, when painstaking professional authorities like Petrie and Brash, both eminently skilled in ancient Irish Architecture, differ, we cannot venture to pronounce any definite judgment.

Brash maintains—and I am inclined to agree with him—that “Petrie has assigned by far too early a date to the introduction of sculptured decoration in Irish Architecture,” or

¹ Address delivered at the summer visit of the Galway Archæological and Historical Society, in 1904, to the Ruined Abbey of Corcomroe.

in other words, that the Romanesque ornamentation did not appear in Ireland as early as Petrie imagined, and he asserts furthermore that "his ascription of the ornamental features in the Church of St. Flannan, at Killaloe, of Rathin, King's County, and of St. Saviour's, Glendalough, to the eighth and ninth centuries cannot for a moment be sustained." This is a very important statement from an eminent authority. I have read both writers carefully, and I feel bound to say that Brash, like Petrie, is a most painstaking and competent investigator, who had moreover a very complete knowledge of Irish history, both sacred and profane. I commend the question to the members of our Society for further investigation.

Brash denies that there is any evidence to show that these Irish ornamental forms of carved decoration existed either in England, Normandy, Germany, or elsewhere, we may assume, at this early period; and he asserts that they cannot be attributed to an earlier date than late in the tenth, or early in the eleventh century. But in the case of Ireland, he admits that, as she was ahead of the West of Europe in the art of ornamental design and illumination—as shown in our existing specimens—and as there was undoubtedly an early and constant intercourse between this country and the Continent, particularly Germany and northern Italy, "we may safely surmise that certain features of the Lombardic or Romanesque style may have been introduced into this country *in the tenth century*, even before the Norman style became prevalent in France." It was not fully developed, however, he admits, until the eleventh and twelfth centuries; but was probably introduced in the tenth, not earlier. With this view I am inclined to agree, not because I am an architectural expert, but because such is the conclusion to which my reading leads me.

I refer to the matter now, not with a view of offering any judgment of my own on the matter, but rather of suggesting to the members of our Society a most interesting question for future discussion, and it is this: were the earliest forms of the Romanesque decoration introduced into Ireland in the seventh century, as Petrie seems to think, or rather in the

tenth century, which is the view that Brash is inclined to adopt ? Any evidence tending to settle this point in one direction or the other, will, I have no doubt, be thankfully received by all the members of our Society, and especially if it can be derived from a careful, artistic and historical investigation of our own County Galway monuments—such, for instance, as those of Kilmacduagh, Clonfert and Cong.

The next question is—who were the men who first introduced the Romanesque into Ireland ? It is not their names I want—these can never be discovered—but their nationality, their motives, their inspiration, the places in Ireland where they first set up and did their earliest work. Now, these are questions I cannot pretend to answer ; and I commend these also to the investigation of our friends, for they are, beyond doubt, extremely interesting. I myself am inclined to think that the wars of the Danes drove great numbers of Irish ecclesiastics to the Continent during the ninth century, and brought them face to face with the more ornate churches in Burgundy, Lombardy, and elsewhere, which were just then growing up under the hands of Romanesque builders. The Irish exiles had an innate natural taste for decoration, as the illuminated books of Erin abundantly prove, hence they admired the Romanesque architecture, and when they got the opportunity they resolved to introduce it into their own country. The lull in the storm of war, towards the close of the ninth century, gave an opportunity to many of those exiled Irishmen, with perhaps some of their disciples, to return home, and they brought with them the newer and nobler forms of ecclesiastical architecture which they had seen abroad. This was certainly the period when the Round Towers were built—nobly built—and I think that the men who built the Round Towers were quite well able to build our earliest Romanesque Churches, with such inspiration as they got from the foreign models, which some at least amongst them must have seen.

But here we must guard against one great mistake, sometimes made by eminent authorities. Our Irish Romanesque builders were no mere imitators. They did not copy what they saw abroad. They caught the inspiration, and followed

the lines of the foreign Romanesque, but nothing more. They developed the new style of architecture on purely national lines. It was national in all its main features—in its ornament, in its outlines, in the graceful harmony of its proportions. This proposition it is not difficult to establish; and it is admitted by our best authorities. They all admit that the Romanesque architecture in Ireland was developed on purely national lines, expressive of the genius, the sympathies, the tendencies, the aspirations of the Gaelic race: still the new style was not a creation, but an evolution or development, under the influence of national thought and feeling. To trace the stages of this evolution is another interesting question, which I leave for solution to our younger artistic members.

The leading features of the Irish Romanesque are well known—the semi-circular arch, with elaborate but appropriate ornamentation; the multiform orders in the doorways and chancel arches, with their endless variety of decoration; the exquisite carving of the capitals and other conspicuous parts, sometimes in the form of human heads of great variety, and sometimes in striking imitation of natural flowers or foliage. Then the church was not large, had no aisles, and rarely transepts, no great east window, or adjoining cloister; it was simply a plain rectangular nave, with smaller rectangular chancel at the east end.

The most characteristic feature of the Primitive style was the narrow doorway with inclining jambs, and horizontal lintel quite destitute of ornament. The first attempt at ornament was a plain architrave round the lintel of the doorway; and the first step towards the Romanesque arch was to cut it out of one or two solid blocks for the window opes. We have a beautiful specimen in the window of Ratass, County Kerry, which also shows one of the earliest attempts at ornamentation in the plain moulding that surrounds it. This church, which is perhaps the finest specimen of its kind in Ireland, belongs to the transition period—the transition from the Primitive or Cyclopean to the Romanesque style. It probably belongs to the beginning of the tenth century.

In the County Galway we have many beautiful specimens

of the pure Romanesque, and also of the transitional Romanesque—by the latter phrase I mean Romanesque passing to the first Pointed style. Of the pure Romanesque I believe, without doubt, one fine specimen, perhaps one of the finest in Ireland, is the old Cathedral of Clonfert, built in a sheltered meadow by the Shannon shore. As a church it is complete, though of very moderate dimensions, with nave, chancel and added (?) transepts, with a small central western tower, but of course no aisles. We do not find them, I believe, in our Irish Romanesque, except perhaps as later additions. But in two of its Romanesque features Clonfert, I think, cannot be surpassed—its western doorway and its eastern or chancel window. I do not trust merely to my own judgment here ; I am supported by the highest expert opinion : “ The entire surface of the piers and jamb-shafts, of which there are six, is covered with an amazing variety of ornament showing a marvellous fertility of invention.” Brash declares that he has not seen this beautiful porch in point of design and execution excelled by any similar features in these islands. Speaking of the east window, he says : “ the design is exceedingly chaste and beautiful, the mouldings are simple and effective, and the workmanship is superior to anything I have seen either of ancient or of modern times. The mouldings are finely wrought, and the pointing of the stone work so close that I cannot believe they were ever worked by tools—there is no appearance of mortar joints, the ashlar must have been rubbed on the joints to make such close work.” He ascribes it to the middle of the twelfth century, and the workmen were probably the same who wrought the noble chancel arch of Tuam Cathedral and the peerless cloisters of Cong. The buildings at Kilmacduagh have many Romanesque features ; but they do not belong to the period of the original church, namely, the first half of the seventh century. The western portal may perhaps belong to that period, for it is Cyclopean in its character, and may have withstood the assaults of the Danish marauders in the early part of the tenth century ; but the structures as a whole, including the beautiful building known as O’Heyne’s Chapel, cannot date earlier than the last half of the tenth century, and probably

they owe their origin either to the example or the munificence of Brian Boru, who was undoubtedly the greatest church builder of his time, and had sent learned men abroad, not only to collect books, but also to ascertain the latest improvements in ecclesiastical architecture on the Continent. It is to those men and their fellows that I should be disposed to ascribe the introduction of the ornamental forms of the Romanesque into Ireland, and that would be about the last quarter of the tenth, and the beginning of the eleventh century.

But as I have already observed it would be a prime mistake to suppose that our Irish builders were mere copyists of what they had seen abroad. No ; the Romanesque ornament in Ireland is distinctively Irish, and is borrowed from ancient forms, the rude originals of which may still be seen in the sepulchral chambers of New Grange, dating therefore not so much from earlier Christian forms in Ireland—but rather from the primitive conceptions of the race first exhibited in the stone monuments of New Grange, then continued in the illuminated books, and afterwards reappearing in the stone carvings of the Romanesque period.

The Cistercian Romanesque, if it can be so called differs materially from the pure Irish Romanesque of a somewhat earlier date. The Cistercians came to Mellifont in 1142, and their monastic church was dedicated in 1157, but unfortunately it has entirely disappeared. We have, however, fine surviving specimens in Boyle, in Knockmoy, and here in Corcomroe, which all belong to the same period, the closing decades of the twelfth century. In all these buildings the Romanesque arch predominates, but we also find in the same buildings one or more specimens of the earliest Pointed arches. This is strikingly the case in Boyle, where three of the noble arches supporting the central tower are Romanesque, while the fourth is Pointed, as if the architect wished to make a compromise between the patrons of the old architecture and the new.

Romanesque decoration is, to a great extent, absent in the Cistercian buildings. The builders constructed edifices of majestic outline and noble proportions ; but they eschewed the varied and elaborate decoration of the older Irish

Romanesque. It was done on principle, just as they put away from their abbeyes gold chalices and crosses, richly embroidered vestments, marble altars, and so forth. They thought, at least when they were in their first fervour, the possession of those things inconsistent with their profession of poverty. They are not opposed to strength and grandeur in their churches—for otherwise these could not endure as buildings worthy of God's presence; but beyond that they did not wish to go.

From the architectural point of view, however, their churches were far larger and more complete than the earlier Romanesque churches. The churches of the greater monasteries were not less than from 120 to 200 feet in length, with aisles and transepts. The older Romanesque churches were, as a rule, not half that length, and were without aisles, although, as in the case of Cormac's chapel and Clonfert, they had sometimes small transepts. It is not easy to account for this sudden increase in the size of the new monastic churches. I think it arises chiefly from the fact that they followed their own larger ideals which they had seen on the Continent. Mellifont was founded directly from Clairvaux; its chief builder, a monk called Robert, came from Clairvaux, and it was a fixed principle in the Order to follow as far as possible the plan of the original Monastery.

Bernard loved the valleys, we are told, though Benedict preferred the hills; and the Irish Cistercians nearly always chose the site of their Monastery in a secluded valley, watered by a pleasant stream, which gave them not only fresh fish, so necessary for fasting men, but also an abundant supply of water, so necessary from a sanitary point of view. The same plan was nearly always followed in all essential points. A large nave for the accommodation of the surrounding people; aisles for the poorer classes, and also to contain the confessionals; transepts with their chapels for special services, especially mortuary services; the choir for the monks when chanting the Divine Office, and the chancel with its noble east window for the monastic Mass. There was always a great central tower, massive but rather low, supported on four noble arches, at the junction of the nave,

choir and transepts. This feature is wanting at Corcomroe. There is a tower at the junction of the nave and choir, but it is not square, nor does it rise from the arches. The transepts contained three, two, or as in Corcomroe, sometimes only one mortuary chapel, on the eastern side. These chapels had a twofold use. In the first place they were necessary to give the priests in the community a suitable place to say their Masses. Then, again, the founder generally had one of these chapels set apart for mortuary Masses for himself and the members of his family; and other great families who helped to endow the monastery had similar, but not exclusive privileges in the other chapels. They were also used, but rarely, for the interment of the abbots or great benefactors of the Abbey.

The monastic buildings for the use of the community were invariably on the southern side of the Church. The south aisle and south transept both opened in the cloister for the accommodation of the monks. The chapter room was next to the south transept and in line with it. It was generally a noble chamber, supported on columns; next was the community room or day room, or calefactory, as it is often called, which in cold weather contained a huge fire to warm the poor monks. In good weather the cloister was the place where the monks met to read, to write, to learn, to converse, to walk, to pray even; but in hard weather they were always allowed to go to the calefactory.

The refectory was generally at the south-eastern angle of the cloister, in close connection with the kitchen and pantries, which occupied the southern wing of the cloister. The western wing of the cloister opened on the buildings for guests and for the guest-master, and workmen who were not regular members of the Community. The schools were also there, and the dispensary, with other necessary buildings. Judging from the fact that all the arches in Corcomroe are slightly pointed although retaining much of the characteristic architecture of the earlier Romanesque, I do not think that its erection can be ascribed to an earlier date than the first quarter of the thirteenth century.

There was one essential element in the constitution of the

Cistercian Monasteries which, I think, ought to commend itself to us all. The Cistercian monks, as a rule, lived by the labour of their own hands ; and the monastery was a school, at once literary and technical, for the whole country round about the monastery, and for the children of all the monastic tenants or dependants. In this respect the Benedictines generally, and the Cistercians particularly, differed from the Mendicant Orders who came after them. The Mendicant's main purpose was to preach the Gospel in crowded cities, and he claimed the right of using St. Paul's privilege of living by the Gospel—that is, he lived on what his auditors freely gave him by way of an alms for his living. I fear some of our economists who think little of the need of preaching the Gospel, would not deem such communities a gain to the country from an economic point of view.

But even from the economic point of view the Cistercian monastery was a distinct gain to the community, and to all its members. No doubt they needed some land—often it was wild and barren land, but they soon made it a smiling garden. Guizot, I think it was, called them the reclaimers of Europe. To this day the fertility of the fields around the ruined monastery speaks eloquently of their labours in the past.

Not in cities, but in secluded valleys like this, they preferred to dwell, always by a stream of running water, to give them fish for their fast days—and that first necessity of civilized life, an abundance of pure water for personal and domestic needs. They called these valleys by most poetic names—they were refugees from the storms and stress of the world, and they loved their beautiful homes with a passionate devoted love.

But every member of the community should work—*Laborare est orare* was their maxim. Work done for the community was in itself a prayer, and had the merit of prayer. Their tasks, of course, were different—but all had to work, and even the abbot, peer of Parliament though he might be, if he was true to his rule, was expected to work some time in the garden or the field. It was good for his own health, and good for the example it gave the community

The monastery was by its labour a self-supporting institution which made the most of all the natural resources at its disposal for the benefit, not only of the inmates of the house, but of the whole surrounding community. The monks fed themselves and the poor on the produce of the crops planted, reaped and dressed by themselves. They clothed themselves with the wool of their own flocks, shorn, spun, woven and sewn by themselves. They built their own monasteries and churches, for amongst the brethren were architects, masons, carpenters, painters—men in fact, of every craft, who were as a rule members of the community.

The literary brothers kept a school for the benefit of all the surrounding children, rich and poor, and these were taught gratuitously, and when they needed it, they were fed gratuitously. They had a dispensary for the benefit of the sick poor, and there was needed no red ticket to get the best medical advice and prescriptions which the monastery could afford. The technical shops had masters to teach all the mechanical arts—and above all, horticulture in the garden, and agriculture in the fields. So, my friends, when you see a monastery like this in its ruins it commands our respect, not only because it was once the sanctuary of religion, the home of self-denying men, but also because it was the school, the dispensary, the hospital, and the alms-house, for the poor of all the country round about it.

WESTERN ARCHÆOLOGY.¹

It is part of the duty of the President of a Society like ours to deliver an Address to its members at the earliest opportunity. The pressure of manifold occupations has, I regret to say, compelled me to defer my Address too long, for which I owe an apology to the members of the Society.

My observations this evening must, I fear, be of a very discursive character, but that is, I may say, inevitable from the nature of my task. On an occasion like this it behoves us to look backwards, and note what has been accomplished, and also to look forwards and take a survey of the work that still remains to be done; and this is all the more necessary because our indefatigable Secretary, Miss Redington, tells me that she finds it very difficult sometimes to get any papers from our members, and if we do not get papers then it will be impossible for us to bring out our Journal regularly.

This I should look upon as a very great misfortune, because as any person of intelligence in matters historical and archæological will readily admit, the numbers of our Journal hitherto published, contain many papers of great importance, and of enduring utility for the history of the West of Ireland, which has yet to be written, and which, if well handled, can be made quite as interesting as any romance. No element is wanting that lends a vivid interest to these records of the past. The story is full—all too full—of scenes of war and bloodshed, of tragedy and treason, of tribal feuds and family quarrels. But it also teems with elements of poetry and pathos and romance. Heroic deeds and great crimes are strangely intermingled; and the warrior who spent his life, or most of it, in deeds of blood, often founds or endows a religious house to which he retires at the end,

¹ Address delivered at a Meeting of the Galway Archæological and Historical Society, on the 19th March, 1906.

to put on the habit of a monk and spend the remnant of his days in penance, prayer, and self-denial. So Rory O'Connor, the last King of Ireland, retired to Cong, and his greater brother, Cathal of the Red Hand, retired to Knockmoy, which he had founded. So the famous Red Earl of Ulster, who plied his sword for fifty years in the bloodiest wars of Ireland, England, Scotland and France, in the end held a Parliament in Kilkenny, during which he gave a farewell banquet to all the great nobles of the Pale, and then retired to the monastery of Athassil, founded by his great-grandfather, and there died some months later in the habit of a monk, and thus went to sleep with his sires on the peaceful banks of the Suir.

So, too, many of the later Burkes, less known to fame, both in Galway and Mayo, founded or endowed religious houses. Sometimes they profaned them by the treacherous slaughter of their own near kinsmen, and sometimes they retired to these religious houses to atone as best they could by a tardy penance for their own terrible deeds of blood. Take the case of four brothers, each of whom was in turn McWilliam Iachtar, about the middle of the fifteenth century. They were sons of Sir Thomas Burke, who gave large endowments to the Abbey of Cong, and their grandfather was that Sir Edmond Albanagh who also gave much land to the Abbey of Cong, and is held responsible by history for the drowning of his cousin and namesake, the son of the Red Earl, in Lough Mask. Well, the eldest of the four brothers, Walter of Shrule, founded the monastery of Annagh on the shore of Lough Carra. He was ancestor of the Earls of Mayo. His second brother, Edmond of the Beard, ancestor to the Viscounts Mayo, was equally renowned for martial prowess and generosity to the Church, so that the old Chronicler of Clonmacnoise—after describing his many noble qualities—fervently adds, “May God’s blessing be with him.” He appears to have been specially generous to the Abbey of Ballintubber, in which at a later period his grandson was slain by his own nephew. The third brother, Thomas Oge of Moyne, founded the beautiful monastery of Moyne in Tirawley on the banks of

the Moy. The fourth brother, Richard of Torlough, resigned his MacWilliamship and retired to the Dominican Monastery of Burrishoole, which he himself had founded, to spend the closing years of his life in prayer and penance; and that entry determines the question of the foundership of Burrishoole.

I mention facts like these to show what a varied and interesting record the history of these great families affords, and also what large obligations we are under to those learned members of this Society who have given us in our Journal such admirable and authentic accounts of Cong, Kilconnell, Knockmoy and Annaghdown. The names of Mr. Martin Blake, Mr. Hubert Knox, Mr. Biggar, Very Rev. Dr. Fahey, our treasurer, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Richard Kelly, and others also whom I might enumerate, will serve to remind you what excellent work this Society of ours has already accomplished.

Next to the monasteries the old castles naturally claim our attention, and here Colonel Nolan has set a splendid example by his carefully written paper—to a great extent the result of personal research on the spot—on the old castles of the barony of Clare. In archaeology proper, such as examination of ancient forts and souterrains, Dr. Costello of Tuam, has done some excellent work. It is a large and fruitful field, however, in which much work still remains to be done by close personal observation and careful inquiry.

All the members of our Association owe a deep debt of gratitude to Mr. Trench for the admirable way in which he has edited the Journal. From every point of view—paper, printing, illustrations, and binding too—it reflects the highest credit on all concerned in the work. It is only those who have had—like myself—to bring out books, or edit a magazine, that can really know the amount of watchful care and labour necessary to edit our Journal in the high style in which that work has been accomplished. The bound volumes are at once an ornament on the table and a most valuable addition to the library.

And now let me proceed to the still more important point of making some useful suggestions for the future. Mr. Falkiner, in his very suggestive paper, has indicated the

sources in which most of our western history must be sought. The general annals of Ireland, having been written by men who were themselves for the most part westerns, contain much information regarding the West. Then special treatises have been written, as you know, on Hy Many, Iar-Connaught, Galway Town, Hy-Fiacragh, Fenagh of Moy Reine—which are of course indispensable for our purposes—not to mention the local histories of living writers like Dr. Fahey, and the O'Connor Don, which are in their own way invaluable. But, above all, the State Papers will be found of the greatest value, for they are contemporary documents of an official, though confidential character, coming too, from those who often took very different views of the same events, and hence exhibiting both sides of various questions. All these works are dear, but may be regarded as absolutely necessary, even to the local historian. None of our members has made more excellent use of these sources of our local history than Mr. H. T. Knox and Mr. Martin Blake. No doubt all these books are not necessary for every investigator, for much will depend on the special subject of enquiry a man may take up, and excellent work may be accomplished with the aid of a very few books—by personal enquiry, and painstaking investigation on the spot. We want, for instance, a systematic examination and description of our chief ancient raths, moats, cahirs and cromlechs, which abound in various parts of the country. It would be most desirable to have them classified by parishes or baronies, with sketches, measurements, and photographs, giving in every case the ancient names as exactly as possible, and above all the local traditions, if any, connected with the places.

These traditions are fast dying out, and the monuments are fast disappearing before what are called “modern improvements,” so that in a short time those ancient memorials of the far distant past, with the living traditions that still cling to them, will have disappeared for ever. Who will give us a complete list of the menhirs or monumental pillar stones still standing in the County Galway, or in the County Mayo, which mark the graves of ancient heroes of the old heroic times? You have a famous one at Rath Cruachan, another

at Roscam, another at the Neale in Mayo, and another beside the sea, north of Killala. But we want a complete list with names, drawings, measurements and surviving traditions. Who will give us a similar list and description of all the ancient inscribed stones in a Barony or County? Who will give us a fuller history and more accurate description of all the Round Towers within our area?—because these Towers are not only most interesting memorials of the past in themselves, but always mark the most important ecclesiastical buildings of their locality. Was there one at Annaghdown? Surely this can be ascertained for certain, after all the recent clearances that have been affected there. Who will give us a complete list of all the fortified crannogues in the County, or make a careful examination of some one or more of them? It would be interesting, for instance to know the present state of the ancient crannogue on Lough Hackett, or Loughrea Lake, with such an examination of the Island area as might be obtained by a little hard work on a dry summer's day? Who will do for the barony of Dunkellin, or Kilmaine, or Carra, what Colonel Nolan has done for the barony of Clare, by giving us a complete list and accurate description of their ancient castles? Or who will give us a full account of even a single one, so far as is now ascertainable—its founders, its date, its famous owners, its sieges, its overthrow, its folk-lore? If a man were, for instance, to give us such a sketch of the Hen's Castle on Lough Corrib, or Hag's Castle on Lough Mask, or Lough Mask Castle itself, or Castle Burke, or Castle Carra, surely he would be able, after careful inquiry, on the spot, to write an interesting account of any of these venerable ruins. Who will give us a list of the blessed Wells of Galway or of Iar-Connaught, or of County Mayo, associated with the name of St. Patrick, or other saints, telling us something of their patron days, their stations, the healing virtue attributed to their waters, and so forth?

Then, again, Mr. Martin Blake has given us in our Journal a very interesting sketch of the O'Flahertys of Ballynahinch, and of their chief castle at Bunowen, but we want also a full account of the famous Murrough Na Doe of Aghanure. We want the romantic story of Grania Uaile, on which the State

Papers throw so much light, for in one of them she gives a brief account of herself, her family, and at least some of her doings, to which I shall refer later on.

Who will write for us a complete monograph of the Great Burkes of the thirteenth century—I mean William FitzAdelm, Richard Mor, Earl Walter, the Red Earl, and his ill-starred grandson, Earl William? Mr. Knox has thrown much light on their history in our Journal, but he rather touches on the doubtful or debated points of their family, as he did not undertake to narrate in full the history of these remarkable men. Yet the full story of each of them would make a most interesting article, and their continuous history would make a most readable booklet. If they were not all good men they were certainly great men—the greatest of their line.

Who will do for the Lower Burkes of Mayo, or for the Upper Burkes of Galway, what Mr. Blake has done for his own illustrious family, giving us a complete account of the various branches, their castles, and their achievements, good and bad? The story of those Mayo Burkes is full of wild romance, but it has not yet found a sympathetic chronicler. Lodge gives an excellent outline—not always exact—but that is all. It will afford, however, a skeleton map which might be fully and accurately filled in from various other sources, not forgetting the still living traditions of each neighbourhood.

The twelfth and thirteenth centuries are perhaps those most interesting in our western story, and furnish ample scope for discussion in the pages of our Journal. Have we or had we any stone castles dating from the twelfth century? Where and by whom were they built? Is there any trace of them still surviving? What bridges were built by Torlough Mor and his sons? Did they build any stone bridges in Connaught? If not, who built our first stone bridges and stone castles? Where were the principal fords and passes and toghers here in the West? What evidence have we of the presence of extensive woods in localities where not a tree is now to be seen? Who will spend a week in Innisboffin to give us a full account of that most interesting island in ancient and mediæval times? Who is St. Leo of Shark, and how did

he come to be its patron saint ? I am told there is much folk-lore still hovering around those remotest islands of the West. Who will fix it for us in the pages of our Journal before it vanishes for ever ? Are there any eagles still nestling in the cliffs, or red deer still roaming through the hills ?—when did the latter disappear ? Are there any flora and fauna to be found there and nowhere else in Ireland ?

Many of our members who may not have time or opportunity to write a long paper, could send a brief note of something they have met in their reading or observed in their wanderings. They could send a photo of some ancient monument, or tell the story of some ancient name, or describe some ancient find, as Dr. Costello has lately done in more than one instance.

The isles of Aran are still only very imperfectly explored, yet in them we have the greatest museum of antiquities, both Pagan and Christian, to be found in any part of Ireland. Each of the islands is in itself a regular treasure house, and every portion of them all deserves the most careful and minute examination, and will certainly repay the patient explorer. A sojourn in any of the islands during the summer months is as pleasant as it is healthful ; and if two or three friendly spirits agreed to spend a fortnight or three weeks thoroughly exploring one of them, and at the same time gathering up the folk-lore of their surroundings, they might give us an account of their sojourn which would be of the greatest value for future inquirers. What is wanted in all such cases is a spirit of enthusiasm begotten of an ardent desire to make known the history of the long forgotten past, so far as existing monuments and traditions can reveal it. It is in itself a fascinating pursuit. It makes the past present, and the distant near. It raises us above the sordid pursuits of daily life and lights up with a kind of sunset glory the mouldering ruins of dismantled churches and castles, yes, even the nameless barrows of the past. It is to awaken and develop this spirit of communion with the past that our Society has been mainly instituted.

I should also like to get a full and exact account of Sir John Perrott's dealings with this western province, and also of Sir

Richard Bingham's ten terrible years in Connaught, for which ample material exists in the State Papers, and the Carew manuscripts. It would likewise be most interesting to collect from the same sources an account of the luckless ships of the Spanish Armada that were cast away on the west coast of Ireland. Local traditions in most cases point out the very rocks on which they were dashed to pieces and the beaches on which the ship-wrecked mariners were thrown up, some few alive but most of them dead. These and a great many similar questions afford ample materials for discussion in the pages of our Journal.

And now, lest some of you might say that it is much easier to ask than to answer questions, I wish to give you really authentic information, which I hope some of my hearers will supplement, regarding that Western heroine to whom I have already referred, Grania Uaile, or Grace O'Malley, as she is called in more elegant phraseology. The two most celebrated Irish women of original native stock of whom I have heard or read are, beyond doubt, Queen Maeve of Cruachan, and Grania, Queen of Clew Bay; and in some respects they were both very much alike. They were both energetic, beautiful, and brave; both ruled their husbands—and each of them had more than one—both were in their methods somewhat unscrupulous, and both within their respective spheres held sway to the close of more than usually prolonged lives. Both, too, have been heroines of fable and romance, so that it is very difficult to separate the real facts of their history from the aggregation of bardic stories and uncertain traditions that cling around their memories.

What I am going to tell you, however, about the redoubtable Grania is certainly authentic, because the information was in the main given by herself, in reply to a certain set of interrogatories which she was ordered to answer in July, 1593. She answered them in the same month, and the answers, eighteen in all, have been fortunately preserved for us in the State Papers. From her replies we gather that she was daughter of Dubh Darra O'Malley—in the State Papers “Doodarro”—who was in his time Chief of Murrisk, or the Upper, that is the Southern Owle. She does not tell us

where she was born, but we know from other sources that the O'Malleys' chief Castle was at Belclare, and, doubtless, she was born in that stronghold by the sea, which has now completely disappeared.

Her mother was Margaret O'Malley of the same country and family, perhaps from Cahir, na Mart, now called Westport, where another branch of the family dwelt. The O'Malleys of Murrisk owned the islands Innisboffin, Innisturk, Clare, and the others off that wild coast. Her family had also twenty townlands in Burrishoole barony; the Earl of Ormond, she tells us, had ten townlands; and the Burkes of McWilliam's country had twenty.

Her first husband was Donall an Chogaidh O'Flaherty, Chieftain of Ballynahinch, with the twenty-four townlands around it, which Teige O'Flaherty of Aghanure seized with a strong hand after her husband's death, but he was afterwards slain in the rebellion. She had two sons. The eldest, Owen, was married to Katherine Burke, daughter of Edmond Burke of Castlebar, and the second was Morogh—who is, she adds, still living. The eldest was mixed up in the McWilliam rebellion of 1586, but at the suggestion of Sir R. Bingham, he retired with his cattle to an island apparently near Omev, where he was treacherously taken prisoner with his friends by the English, whom he had hospitably invited to the island, and was afterwards slain by them in a tumult of their own getting up. John Bingham was the prime mover in this plot, and amongst eighteen others on that occasion he hanged poor Tibbot O'Toole, who was then 90 years of age. Her second son, Morogh, and her grandson, Donell, son of Owen, are still alive, she said, and enjoy part of the barony of Ballynahinch.

Her second husband was Sir Richard Burke, the McWilliam, or chief of his nation, and by him she hath a son Theobald Burke, "now living," and married to a daughter of O'Conor Sligo. He possessed forty townlands in Carra, the Northern Owle, and Gallen. She does not tell us that he was born at sea, and was therefore called Tibbot na Lung. Tibbot was on the whole loyal to the English, and was made a Viscount

by James I. His son, the second Viscount, was held responsible by Cromwell's officers for the lamentable massacre at the bridge of Shrute during the troubles of 1641, and would undoubtedly have been hanged if he were taken alive. Failing him they hanged his son, and confiscated his estates; and so the line of the Viscounts Mayo came to a tragic end. That massacre of Shrute is a matter that deserves more careful investigation than it has yet received and further inquiry will show, I believe, that Viscount Mayo was in no way responsible for it.

After the death of her last husband, Grania collected her followers and her cattle—a thousand head of cows and mares—and went to dwell at Carrigahowley, in Burrishoole, which belonged to the Earl of Ormond; but when her son was murdered in 1586, she was invited by Sir R. Bingham to remove from her sea-girt castle and live under his safeguard. But John Bingham, his brother, attacked them on the way, and tied her with a rope, and robbed her of her castle; and Sir Richard, instead of protecting her, erected “a new gallows for her last funeral,” but he released her on the pledge or surety of the Devil's Hook, who, we know from other sources, was her son-in-law.

Later on she joined in the rebellion provoked by Bingham's cruelty, but escaped with her galleys to Ulster, to O'Neill and O'Donnell, and there she stayed two months. Her galleys, however, were wrecked by a storm, and she found it necessary to return to Connaught, from which she went to Dublin and “received her Majesty's gracious pardon six years ago, through Sir John Perrott that is in 1587, and she is now free.” Since that time she lived in Connaught a farmer's life, very poor, paying cess, and also her Majesty's composition rent, and she gave up utterly her “former trade of maintenance by land and sea”—that is of lifting all she could from her enemies.

As for Kill Castle, about which she was asked, she “knows no town of that name.” She knew the town well enough, but she truly says there was no castle there; the castle was on the other side of the narrow ford running into Streamstown Bay. It is still called the Castle of Doon, and its ruins remain

to this day, but either Grania or her husband or son, Owen slew McConroy on the other side of the water, at the Church of Kill, and hence it did not suit her to know anything of Kill.

Old as she was she still desires her Majesty's letter, under her hand, for license during her life to invade with fire and sword all her Majesty's enemies by land and sea. We also know that she went to London and saw the Queen, but no particulars are given. Grania's grave is in the old Abbey of Clare Island.

These facts in the life of Grania aile, are, as we have said, undoubtedly authentic. There are other alleged incidents in her career of a more doubtful character. The State Papers tells us that she went to London, and no doubt she saw the Queen, for the purpose of her visit was to petition her Majesty for a grant of lands for her maintenance, and also to ask a title for her son, which he afterwards received. The account of her interview with the Queen is rather dubious; but it must have been of a highly interesting character, if we could get the exact facts. More dubious still is the abduction of the heir of Howth Castle as a punishment for the alleged inhospitality of the family; but it is just what Grania would do. There is a celebrated painting in Howth Castle which represents the abduction—a fact which goes far to prove the authenticity of the story. But it would be very desirable if some of our members could ascertain what evidence is forthcoming in support of it.

Grania had, it is said, no less than six strongholds around Clew Bay and its neighbourhood. She had her ancestral castle at Belclare; she had another on Innisboffin; she had a strong castle, which is still to be seen, on Clare Island. She tells us herself she dwelt in Carrigahowley, now called Rockfleet, and tradition also tells us that she had a castle commanding the mouth of Achill Sound at Kildavnet; not content with these she seized by stratagem the castle of Doona, which gave her the command of Blacksod Bay. Clare Island castle was her strongest fortress, for there she was unassailable by any of the native chieftains; and at Carrigahowley she had not only a strong castle—it is there

still—but also an excellent harbour for her galleys, much the best on Clew Bay, for it is deep, well-shelterd, with good holding ground, and easy both of ingress and egress ; and the same cannot be said of either Westport or Newport. It was on the neighbouring inlet of Burrishoole that Queen Elizabeth proposed to found the county town of Mayo ; and Queen Elizabeth was right. It is the best site for the purpose on the western coast ; and the county town of a maritime county ought to be a seaport town.

I hope some of our members will pursue this subject further, and give us a fuller account of the redoubtable Grania than I can do at present.¹ But for that purpose it will be necessary to visit all her castles, so as to gather up all the local traditions, and also to give us photos and measurements of the buildings themselves.

Let me add in conclusion, that I earnestly hope that our learned members will write some papers for our Journal, be they long or short, and give us their best assistance in maintaining in a flourishing condition the Galway Archæological and Historical Society, which, in a few years has already accomplished so much excellent work.

¹ Since this paper was prepared the writer has published a fuller account of the life and times of Grania Uaile. See *Irish Essays, Literary and Historical*. Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 1908.

INDEX.

A.

ABELARD, Peter, 172.
 Aberdour, Columban monastery of, 197.
 Aenach Tiroillila, location of, 352.
 Anglo-Norman Invasion, the, 45 ; object of, 50, 53.
Annals of Kilronan, 28.
Annals of Ulster, 145, 501, 504, 505.
 Anselm, *vide* St. Anselm.
 Apostles, the, public life of, 35.
 Aran Islands, the, Gerald Barry's description of, 52 ; archaeology of, 358.
 Archaeology, study of, 103.
 Archaeology, Western, 532-543.
 Architecture, Irish Romanesque, 1-3, 64-65, 522-531.
 Architecture in Ireland, primitive Christian, 1, 522.
 Architecture, Irish Pointed, 522.
 Ardilaun, or Ard Oilean, ruins of, 231-243.
 Aristotle, works and teachings, 175 *et seq.*, 451, 511.
 Armagh Cathedral, consecration of, 137.
 Armagh, pilgrimages to, 499.
 Arthur, King, legend of, 116.

B.

BADLEY, Philip, chief scribe of *Annals of Loch Cé*, 28.
 Baedan, Mac Hy Muredach, joint king of Ireland, 88.
 Ballot Act, the, 42.
 Barry, Gerald, on Cistercians, 15 ; sketch of, 45-57 ; ancestors of, 45 ; visits to Rome, 46 ; his election to see of St. David's, 46-47 ; "Giraldus Cambrensis," why called, 46 ; literary works of, 47 ; character of, 48-50 ; literary style of, 54-55 ; on the Irish prelates, 366.
 Beautiful, the, 111-112.

Bede, Venerable, 13, 78 ; his "Lives" of St. Cuthbert, 81 *et seq.* ; 206, 207.
 Bede, the Pict, 196 *et seq.*
 Bellarmine, on the Scriptures, 432, 443 ; on Civil Power, 476 *et seq.*
 Benedict XII., Pope, on the Scriptures, 410.
 Benedict XIV., Pope, on elections to vacant Parishes, 369, 371.
 Bingham, John, 540, 541.
 Bingham, Sir Richard, 539, 540.
 Blessed Virgin, the, Tennyson on, 119.
Bobbio Missal, the, 253 *et seq.*
Book of Armagh, 145.
Book of Ballymote, 399.
 Boyle, *Annals of*, 18, 29.
 Boyle, Abbey of, 2, 21.
 Brian Boru, 69, 501, 527.
 Brownson, Orestes A., works of, 446-455 ; his views on Protestantism, 447.
 Burke, Edmund, 377-382.
 Burke, Theobald, or Tibbot na Lung, 1st Viscount Mayo, 540.
 Burkes, the, of Galway and Mayo, 533, 537, 540.

C.

CAELESTIUS, 217.
Cambrensis Eversus, by Dr. John Lynch, 56-57.
 Canterbury, See of, its primatial right over Ireland, 203-216.
 Carrowmore, ancient monuments at, 531.
 Cassian of Marseilles, 223.
 Catholic Church, the organism of, 119.
 Catholic Emancipation, 37.
 Catholic Hierarchy in England, restoration of, 326.
 Celestine, Pope, *Vide* St. Celestiné.
 Cellach, or Celsus, *Vide* St. Celsus.
 Children of Lir, 109.

Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, 208.

Chronicon Scotorum, 7, 402.

Church, the Irish, in eleventh and twelfth centuries, 3-9; fidelity of, 61; primatial right of Canterbury over, 203-216.

Church, the Anglo-Norman, 70.

Church and State, co-operation of, 33, 450-455, 457 *et seq.*

Church in France, the, 327.

Cistercians in Ireland, the, 1-17; martyrs in Ireland, 16-17.

Cistercian Abbeys in Ireland, 9, 11, 21, 522, 527.

Citeaux, or Cistercium, abbey of, 7.

Citizen, the priest as, 34.

Civil Power, origin, etc. of, 473-486.

Clairvaux, monastery of, 7.

Claudius Clement, Bishop of Auxerre, 461.

Clement, the Scot, 460.

Clergy, the Irish, Gerald Barry on, 53.

Clonfert, cathedral of, 2, 526, 528.

Clonmacnoise, 2.

Clyn, John, Irish annalist, 463.

Colman, Bishop of Lindisfarne, 94.

Confederation of Kilkenny (1641), 466.

Conference of Whitby, 94, 97.

Cong, abbey of, 2, 553.

Connaught, Annals of, 18.

Corcomroe, abbey of, 529.

Cormac's Chapel, 2, 6; dedication of, 64, 151; 528.

Council of Florence, on the Scriptures, 408 *et seq.*

Council of the Vatican, on the Scriptures, 405 *et seq.*

Council of Trent, law *re vacante* Parishes, 367-376; on the Scriptures, 405, *et seq.*

Crinder, Battle of, 347, 348.

Cromwell, Oliver, 469.

Cuildremhne, Battle of, 351, 352.

Cullen, his Eminence Cardinal, writings of 123-126; Pastoral letter of, 124; Synodical address of, 125; 284.

D.

DANISH Invasion, the, 207.

Dante, 192.

David I., King of Scotland, 198.

de Barri, William, father of Gerald Barry, 45.

de Courcy, John, 14, 502.

Deer, Book of, 194-202.

Deer, Columban monastery of, 195 *et seq.*; foundation of, 196.

Dimock, Rev. T. F., editor of works of Gerald Barry, 47, 48, 55.

Domhnall, or Domnaldus, Archbishop of Cashel, 208.

Dominicans, the, 164, 177.

Downpatrick, pilgrimages to, 501.

Druidism, 354.

Duns Scotus, John, 62; 154-193; birthplace of, 155; at Oxford, 159; at Paris, 165; at Cologne, 167; death and burial of, 169; works and teachings of, 179; on metaphysics, 517.

E.

EDUCATION, Edmund Burke on, 380.

Education, Catholic, 37, 125, 126.

Education, Primary, Royal Commission on, 126.

Education, Intermediate, 129.

Education, University, in Ireland, 129; 258-295; Government scheme and views of the Irish Bishops (1866), 264; Fawcett's Bill (1867), 267, 271; Earl of Mayo's proposals (1868), 269; Mr. Gladstone's scheme (1873), 272; The Royal University (1879), 274, 325.

Elizabeth, Queen, persecution of Cistercians, etc., 15-17, 470.

Emancipation, Catholic, 37.

Eucharistic Congress, at London (1908), 326.

Eugenius, bishop of Ardmore, 87.

F.

FAITH, 58.

Fenianism, 132, 133.

Firbis, Clan, of Leacan, 392-403.

Fitzgerald, Justice, judgment of, 42.

Fitzgerald, Maurice, justiciary, 25.

FitzStephen, lands at Bannow (1169), 54.

Folklore, meaning of, 106.
Four Masters, Annals of, 12, 28, 29, 240.
 Franciscans, the, arrival in England and Ireland, 157; early habits and works of, 159 *et seq.*; at Paris, 177.
 Franzelin, Cardinal, on the Scriptures, 437.
 Froude, historian, 45.

G.

GELASIUS, Pope, 255.
 Gerald of Windsor, 45.
 Geraldines, origin, etc., of the, 45, 53.
 Gillebert, bishop of Limerick, 5, 7, 8, 87.
 Glendalough, abbey of, 2.
 Gothric, king of Dublin and Man, 211.
 Grace, John, Irish annalist, 464.
 Grania Vaile, *Vide* Grace O'Malley.
 Gregory II., Pope, 458.
 Grianan of Calry, the, location of, 531.
 Grunnius, or Rufinus of Aquileia, 218 *et seq.*

H.

HENRY II., description of the Irish, 50; Barry's *Topography* dedicated to, 50.
 Henry VIII., persecution of Cistercians, 15-17.
 Herefrith, Rev. Father, contemporary of St. Cuthbert, 78 *et seq.*
 Howth Castle, story of Grace O'Malley, 542.

I.

IMMACULATE Conception, the, 136, 154, 166, 169.
 Inis Mac Nerinn, Columban monastery of, 18, 20, 29.
 Innismurry, island and ruins of, 487-496.
 Innocent II., Pope, reception of St. Malachy, 8.
 Ireland, Gerald Barry's description of, 51, 52.
 Ireland and Rome, 322-331.

Ireland, pre-Christian civilization in, 357.

Irish, the, Gerald Barry's description of, 52; Henry II. on ditto., 50; divine mission of, 66.

Irish missionary monks, the, 67.

J.

JOHN, Prince, lands at Waterford (1185), 45, 51; character of, 47.

Joyces, the, 393, 394.

K.

KENNETH Mac Alpin, King of Scotland, 198.

Kilronan, Annals of, 28.

Knocknarea, derivation of, 352.

L.

LANFRANC, archbishop of Canterbury, 6, 203 *et seq.*

Leacan, Castle of, 392, 394, 398.

Lecky, Prof. W. H., on Edmund Burke, 379.

Leo the Great, Pope, 145, 255, 310, 324.

Leo XIII., Encyclical on Civil Power, 473; ditto. on metaphysics, 512.

Lindisfarne, monastery and See of, 94.

Liturgies, Roman, Gallican, Irish, etc., 250-257.

Loch Cè, or Key, location and description of, 18-19; origin of name, according to legend, 19; geological origin, of, 20.

Loch Cè, Annals of, 18-31; MS. copy in Trinity College, Dublin, history of, 26-28; opinions of O'Curry, O'Donovan, etc., 26, 28, 29, 30; 398, 506.

Lombard, Peter, bishop of Paris, 174.

Loreto, the Holy House of, 332-344.

Lorrha, monastery of, 249.

Lough Derg, pilgrimages to, 502.

Lynch, Rev. Dr. John, author of *Cambrensis Eversus*, 49, 54-56.

M.

- MACCAGHWELL, Hugh, archbishop of Armagh, 156.
 MacCarthy, Cormac, king and bishop, 64.
 MacCearbhaill, Diarmaid, king of Ireland, 352.
 MacDermotts, the, origin and history of, 21, 27, 30, 31.
 MacDermott, Brian, chief of Moylurg, 27, 29, 30.
 MacDermott, Rory, chief of Moylurg, 27, 30.
 MacEgans, the, of Lower Ormond, 400.
 Mac Firbis, Donnach, 398, 399.
 Mac Firbis, Duaid or Dubhaltach, 395, 400; works of, 401.
 Mac Firbis, Giolla Iosa, 398, 399.
 Mac Firbis, Giolla Iosa Mor, 393, 397.
 MacHale, Most Rev. Dr., 129, 130.
 MacMahon, Heber, soldier-bishop, 22.
 Mac Mailin, Clarus, archdeacon of Elphin, refounds abbey on Trinity Island (1215), 24.
 MacManus, Terence Bellew, funeral of, 132.
 Magh Tuireadh, or Moytura, Battle of, 19, 20, 102, 104, 347.
 Malchus, bishop of Waterford, 5, 6, 214.
 Maynooth College, Commission of (1853), 42; establishment of, 381.
 Maeve, Queen, 539.
 Mellifont Abbey, foundation of, 9; dedication of, 65, 151, 527.
 Melrose, or Mailros, Irish monastery of, 95.
 Metaphysics, 510 *et seq.*
Metaphysics of the School, by Rev. Thos. Harper, S.J., 510-521.
 Monks, primitive Irish, oratories and cells of, 9.
 Monks, Irish missionary, 67.
 Moran, his Eminence Cardinal, 123; on St. Boniface, 456, *et seq.*
 Muircertach, king of Ireland, 88.

N

- NATIONAL Schools, the, 127.
 New Grange, antiquities of, 527.
 Newman, Cardinal, "*Mission of St. Benedict*," and "*The Benedictine Schools*," 10; on the Scriptures, 404 *et seq.*

O.

- O'BRIEN, Murtoth, king of Ireland, 6, 213, 215.
 O'Brien, Turlogh, king of Ireland, 211.
 O'Connell, Daniel, the Liberator, 37.
 O'Connor, Roderick or Rory, king of Ireland, 533.
 O'Curry, Eugene, 26, 28, 29.
 O'Davoren of Burren, the, 400.
 O'Donnell, Hugh Roe, Address to his Soldiers, 244-246.
 O'Donovan, Dr. John, 26, 28, 498.
 O'Dowd, the, of Tireragh and Tirawley, 395; ceremony of inauguration, 396.
 O'Duignans, the, of Kilronan, compilers of *Annals of Loch Cé*, 28, 29.
 O'Dunan, bishop of Cashel, 6, 7.
 O'Hagan, Imar, archbishop of Armagh, 5, 6, 146.
 O'Haingly, Donatus, bishop of Dublin, 213.
 O'Haingly, Samuel, bishop of Dublin, 213.
 O'Heney, Mathew, archbishop of Cashel, 87.
 O'Malley, Grace, 530-543.
 O'Moore, Dionysius, bishop of Elphin, 25.
 O'Mulloy, Albinus, bishop of Ferns, 87.
 O'Neill, Owen Roe, 460.
 O'Queely, Malachy, archbishop of Tuam, 356.
 O'Rorke, Ven. Archdeacon, historian of Sligo, 345 *et seq.*
 Ossory, historians of, etc., 463-472.

P.

- PALE, the, 51.
 Pallium, origin, etc. of the, 359.
 Paparo, Cardinal and Papal Legate, 146, 365.

Parishes, vacant, concursus for, 367-376.
 Paschal Question, the, 94, 314. *et seq.*
 Patrician pilgrimages, 497-509.
 Patrick, bishop of Dublin (1074), 210.
 Pelagianism, 217-230 ; 251.
 Pelagius, 140, 142, 217 *et seq.*
 Perrott, Sir John, 541.
 Pius IX., Pope, on erroneous or heretical propositions, 429.
 Pius X., Pope, and the Church in France, 327.
 Politics, the Priest in, 32-44 ; Religion and, 450 ; *See also* Church and State.
 Primal Matter and Substantial Forms, doctrine of 513.
 Proselytism, 127.
 Protestantism, views of O. A. Brownson on, 447.
 Ptolemy, on Ireland, 357.
 Purgatory, St. Patrick's, in Lough Derg, 502.

Q.

QUEEN'S Colleges, the, 125, 129, 262 ; supplemental charter of (1866), 267.
 Questions, mixed, 34, 37, 43, 454 ; profane ditto., 43.

R.

RATHCROGHAN, or Rath Cruachan, 104.
 Reginald of Coldingham, biographer of St. Cuthbert, 85, 86.
 Rock of Cashel, 2.
 Rosserk, or Ros Seance, abbey of, 393, 394.
 Rothe, David, bishop of Ossory, 467 *et seq.*
 Rufinus of Aquileia, or Grunnius, 218, *et seq.*

S.

St. AIDAN, of Lindisfarne, 94, 96.
 St. Anselm, 5, 6, 173, 206, 213.
 St. Augustine, 140 ; 217 *et seq.* ; 299, 324 ; on the Scriptures, 417, 433 *et seq.* ; on Civil Power, 476.
 St. Basil, on the Scriptures, 439.

St. Benedict, 10, 13.
 St. Bernard, 4 ; his monastery at Clairvanx, 7, 8 ; his "Life" of St. Malachy, 7 ; at the Council of Sens (1140), 173 ; on the Pallium, 366.
 St. Bonaventure, 177, 192.
 St. Bonitace, nationality of, etc., 456-462.
 St. Brendan, voyage of, 238.
 St. Cadoc, or Docus, 253, 254.
 St. Celestine, Pope, 139, 142, 224, 226, 324.
 St. Celsus, or Cellach, 5, 6, 7.
 St. Columba, or Columcille, founds monastery in Inis Mac Nerinn, 20 ; birth, etc., of, 80 ; 195 ; at Battle of Cuidremhne, 353 ; 487, 495, 501.
 St. Columba, of Terryglass, 249.
 St. Cummian of Clonfert, 315.
 St. Cuthbert, nationality of, 78-100 ; "Lives" of, 78 *et seq.* ; death of, 99, 100.
 St. David, of Menevia, 227, 253, 254.
 St. Docus, or Cadoc, 253, 254.
 St. Drostan, 196 *et seq.*
 St. Epiphanius, on the Scriptures, 439.
 St. Feehin, 240.
 St. Finian, 353.
 St. Germanus, of Auxerre, 255 *et seq.*, 251.
 St. Gildas, 253, 254.
 St. Gregory the Great, 324, 360.
 St. Jerome, on Pelagianism, 217 *et seq.* ; on the Scriptures 433 *et seq.*
 St. Killian, 229.
 St. Livinus, 296-307.
 St. Malachy, 6-9 ; "Life" of, by St. Bernard, 7 ; 65, 87 ; visits Rome, 146 ; 213.
 St. Mary's Abbey, Dublin, 206.
 St. Molaise, 487 *et seq.*
 St. Ninian, 140, 324.
 St. Patrick, 8 ; first church of, 63 ; divine commission of, 138 ; Pope Celestine's commission, 139 ; on the Holy Mountain, 147 ; in Britain, 225 ; Synod of 227 ; at Lerins, 251 ; receives Papal approbation, 310, 324, 355.
 St. Patrick's Cathedral, Armagh, consecration of, 137 *et seq.*
 St. Prosper, of Aquitaine, 217 *et seq.*

St. Ruadhan, of Lorrha, 249.
 St. Thomas, 154, 165, 177;
 works and teachings of, 177
et seq.; on the Scriptures,
 417, 441; on Civil Power,
 476; on metaphysics,
 511.
 St. Thomas, of Canterbury, 47;
 reference to by Gerald Barry,
 48; 70.
 St. Virgilius, of Salzburg, 297,
 460.
 Saints, Irish, three orders of,
 253.
 Saints, invocation of, 121.
 Saints' Island, or Trinity Island,
 30.
 Sabina, mother of St. Cuthbert,
 87 *et seq.*
 Saviour, Our, public life of, 35.
 Scholastic Theology, 170.
 Scholastic Physics, 187.
 Scholasticism, or Scholastic Phil-
 osophy, 171, 174 *et seq.*,
 514.
 Scotus Erigena, John, 154.
 Scriptures, the, inspiration of 404-
 445.
 Secret Societies, 131.
 Shannon, river, 19; described
 by Gerald Barry, 51.
 Shrael, massacre of (1641), 541.
 Sligo, History of, by Ven. Arch-
 deacon O'Rorke, 345-358.
 Sligo Abbey, 355.
 Statute of Kilkenny (1367), 465.
 Stowe Missal, the, 247-257.
 Suarez, on Wills, 387; on the
 Scriptures, 434; on Civil
 Power, 476 *et seq.*; on
 metaphysics, 511 *et seq.*
 Synod of Adamnan, 318.
 Synod of Brevy (519), 227.
 Synod of Caerleon (529), 227.
 Synod of Fiadh Mac Engusa, in
 Meath, 7.
 Synod of Kells (1152), 146, 216,
 366.
 Synod of Magh Lene (630), 314,
 315.
 Synod of Magh Ailbe, 316.
 Synod of Rathbreasail, 7.
 Synod of St. Patrick, 145, 227,
 311.
 Synod of Thurles (1850), 126, 129,
 262.

Synods, general, national, etc.,
 308; use of Pallium at,
 363.

T.

TACITUS, on Ireland, 357.
 Tennyson, poetry of, 111-122, 192.
 Terryglass, monastery of, 249.
 Thomas, archbishop of York, 203.
 Todd, Dr., antiquarian, 28.
 Transubstantiation, doctrine of,
 171.
 Trent, Council of, *Vide* Council of
 Trent.
 Trinity, the Holy, 173.
 Trinity Island, abbey of, 18, 22,
 24, 29, 30.
 Turlach Airt, 108.

U.

ULTRAMONTANISM, 124, 128.
 University, the Catholic, 125, 126,
 130, 258.
 University, Oxford, foundation
 and early endowments of,
 158; early courses and
 degrees at, 163.
 University of Paris, 164, 176.
 University, The Royal, 274.
 University Education in Ireland,
Vide Education.

W.

WADDING, Luke, 62, 155, 167,
 177, 468.
 Ware, Sir James, 28, 155, 237,
 403.
 Whately, Archbishop, 127, 128.
 Whitby, Conference of (664), 94,
 96, 317.
 Wills, informal, force of, 383-391.
 Winchester, Council of (1072),
 203.

Y.

Yellow Book of Leacan, 398.

Z.

ZACHARY, Pope, 457 *et seq.*

CORRIGENDA.

Page 244, line 27, for "Essex," read "Essex'."

Page 263, line 2, for "1874," read "1847."

Page 502, line 29, for "latter," read "later."

Page 503, line 2, for "in the middle of the lake," read "near the margin of the lake."

Page 504 line 23 for "*avaritice* " read "*avaritiæ*."

Page 507, line 17, for "and," read "which."



